00037441

00037441

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018

MACEDONIA

A BULWARK AGAINST GERMANY

The Fight of the Slovenes, the Western Branch of the Jugoslavs, for National Existence

By BOGUMIL VOSNJAK, late Lecturer of the University of Zagreb (Croatia).

Translated by FANNY S. COPELAND.

Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net. *Postage 5d.*

"Not only a piece of powerful propaganda, but a literary production of high quality. Full of illumination on Near Eastern questions."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

A DYING EMPIRE

By BOGUMIL VOSNJAK.

With a Preface by T. P. O'CONNOR, M.P.

Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net. *Postage 5d.*

In this account of the Dying Empire of Austria the author has tried to describe the sociological factors in the breakdown of the Hapsburg Empire, and to show that in the fabric of a "Central Europe" is closely woven the idea of a predominating Pan-Germanism. Either Germany must stretch from Hamburg to Trieste and Salonika, or Austria-Hungary must be dismembered. There is no alternative.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LIMITED

MACEDONIA

BY

T. R. GEORGEVITCH

U.U.-e-51

37441

ac

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Gen/Mac
37441

First published in 1918

(*All rights reserved*)

PREFACE

TRADITIONS and accepted opinions die hard, no matter what their origin. Even the most erroneous view, once it has taken root, can only be disproved with great difficulty. It has become a matter of *conviction*, or *belief*, and these are really *feelings*, and have no direct connection whatsoever with logic and truth; people will be as firmly convinced in their belief in a falsehood as in their belief in a truth. In course of time, individual, social, and national interests, both material and moral, become so firmly bound up with the existing belief that they render it all the more immune to criticism.

In scientific questions an accepted opinion possesses as great a prestige as one which bears upon the material interests of an individual or nation. The number of those who trouble to go to the fountain-head and get their information at first hand is very small indeed; the rest perforce accept information and conclusions without verifying them. By dint of constant repetition a given information gains universal belief, as for the majority of people the repetition of an assertion has as much value as an argument, and one which they are least able to oppose.

In this book the author has tried to collate his facts and publish them as a contribution to the elucidation

of the Macedonian question. After all, the adducing of facts is still the best way of arriving at the truth; wherefore the reader is asked—independently of the author's conclusions, and passing over all that might have a polemical tone in the text—kindly to give his attention to the facts which are marshalled in this book, and to form his own opinion, independent of his own preconceived ideas and independent of the author's opinion.

T. R. G.

LONDON, *January* 1918.

SERBIAN ORTHOGRAPHY

š = sh in English "*ship*."
c = ts ,, "*cats*."
č = ch ,, "church."
ć = (the same, softer = t in "nature").
j = y in English "*you*."
ž = in French "*jour*."
nj = n in English "*new*."
g = g ,, "*got*."

CONTENTS

I

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

Confusion as regards definition of Macedonia—Correct conception of Macedonia—Origin of confusion—Subject of this book—Historical and literary sources consulted by the author.

II

THE SOUTHERN SLAVS 12

The Southern Slavs and their arrival in their present territory—Ethnographic changes brought about by their arrival—Ethnical unity of the Southern Slavs—The Bulgars and their invasion of the Southern Slav lands between the Danube and the Balkan mountains—Contrast between the Bulgars and the conquered Slavs—Their gradual fusion into the present Bulgarian nation—Traces of old Bulgarian qualities in the modern Bulgars—Territory in which the present Bulgarian nation was evolved.

III

THE MACEDONIAN STATE 22

The Macedonian Slavs—Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Contrast between the Bulgars and the Macedonian Slavs—Adverse conditions under the Bulgars—Revolt of the Macedonian Slavs and emancipation from the Bulgars—Renewal of Byzantine domination in Macedonia—Revolt and emancipation from Byzantium—The Macedonian State—Its rise—Frontiers—Name of the Macedonian State.

IV

PAGE

BULGARIAN RULE IN MACEDONIA 29

Subjugation of the Macedonian State by Byzantium in 1018—Bulgars shake off the Byzantine yoke in 1186—Second Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Macedonia under the Latins and Epirotes—Fresh Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Macedonia under the Byzantines and Epirotes—Bulgars possess Macedonia once more for a brief period and then lose it for good in 1256.

V

SERBIAN RULE IN MACEDONIA 33

Systematic unification of Serbian territory under the Nemanjići—Part of Macedonia won by King Uroš in 1258—Macedonia added to Serbia under King Milutin and King Stephan Dečanski—Bulgaria makes war upon Stephan Dečanski in 1330—Macedonia's fate permanently decided in favour of Serbia by the Serbian victory over the Bulgars—Subsequent insignificance of Bulgaria—Serbian magnanimity towards Bulgaria—King (afterwards Tsar) Dušan unites the whole of Macedonia with Serbia—Bulgars no longer interested in Macedonia—Bulgars conscious of having no claim on Macedonia—Bulgars recognize the legitimacy of the Serbian rule in Macedonia—Macedonia considered a Serbian country—Macedonians never called anything but "Serbs" in historic records—Dismemberment of the Serbian Empire—Macedonian States always referred to as "Serbian"—Turks conquer Macedonia as a Serbian country—This fact recognized by all historic sources, including Bulgarian—Serbian influence in Macedonia under the Turkish rule—Serbian princes in Macedonia under Turkish suzerainty—Serbian Sultana Marija and her importance for the Macedonian Serbs.

VI

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN RULES IN MACEDONIA 56

Comparative duration of Bulgarian and Serbian rules in Macedonia—Bulgars and conquered Slavs in Macedonia

PAGE

two nations—Bulgars are masters, and Macedonians slaves —Reasons why they never mingled—No traces left of Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, either ethnically or as regards civilization—Misconceptions concerning Bulgaria's *rôle* in the creation of Slav letters and literature—The Macedonians pioneers of Christianity among the Slavs—The first Slav apostles natives of Macedonia—Bulgars also receive Christianity from Macedonia—Language of earliest Slav books merely called "Slav"—Second Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, short, tyrannical, and obnoxious.

Serbs and Macedonians are but one nation—Serbian rulers the liberators and uniters of the Serbian nation into one state entity—Serbian rule in Macedonia represents the zenith of Serbian civilization—Building of monasteries and intellectual progress in Macedonia—Serbian literature in Macedonia—Dušan's Code originated in Macedonia—Macedonia the heart and focus of the Serbian Empire —Serbian capitals situated in Macedonia—State Councils, at which the fate of the nation was decided, held in Macedonia—It was in Macedonia that Serbia was elevated to the rank of an Empire and the Serbian Church to that of a Patriarchate—Byzantine influence reaches Serbia through Macedonia.

VII

TURKISH RULE IN MACEDONIA 70

Complete disappearance of the Bulgars under Turkish rule—Serbian national life not arrested by Turkish conquest—Macedonians remain Serbian under Turkish rule —Significance of the independent Serbian Patriarchate for the Serbian nation during the Turkish rule—Macedonia an integral part of the Serbian Patriarchate.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE LOSS OF HER INDEPENDENCE TO THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE (1418–1459) 75

The *rôle* of the Serbian State devolves upon the Serbian Patriarchate—Character of the Serbian Patriarchate—Serbian sentiment among the Macedonian clergy—Serbian

PAGE

sentiment among the Macedonian people—The Macedonians seek refuge only among Serbs—They feel among kinsmen with the Serbs—Part played by Macedonians among the Serbs as a whole.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE TO ITS RESTORATION (1459–1557) 80

Suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate and its supersession by the Archiepiscopate of Ochrida—Greek character of the Archiepiscopate; Slav and Serbian clergy in it—Detriment caused to the Serbian nation by the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Vitality of the Serbian nation—The Archiepiscopate of Ochrida "Serbicized"—Sad plight of the Serbian people in those days—Serbian literature barely kept alive in Macedonia—Serbian sentiment of the clergy in Macedonia—Serbian historic records and sources call the Macedonians "Serbs"—Other historic sources do the same.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE RESTORATION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE TO ITS SECOND SUPPRESSION (1557–1766) 90

Restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate—Jurisdiction of the restored Serbian Patriarchate based on the principle of nationality—Reorganization of the Church; the standard of religion, literature, and national life raised within the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate—Increased importance of the Serbian Patriarchs—Their relations with foreign Powers—Hard lot of the Serbs in Macedonia—Macedonian missions solicit help in Russia for Serbian Churches—These missions call themselves "Serbian"—The Serbian migrations—Macedonian emigrants everywhere call themselves "Serbian"—Relations between Macedonian emigrants and Macedonian Serbs—Migrations *en masse* from Macedonia to Austria under Patriarch Arsenije III—Serbian sentiment of Macedonian emigrants in Austria—*Rôle* of Macedonians among the Serbs in

PAGE

Austria—Serbian historic records speak of Macedonians as "Serbs"—So do all non-Serbian historic records—Suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Protest by the Metropolitan of Montenegro against this crime against the Serbian nation as a whole, of which the Macedonians also form part.

VIII

MACEDONIA AND THE SERBIAN STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION 109

Serbian sentiment of the Macedonians after the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Sad plight of Macedonia after the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Serbian sympathy for Macedonia—Macedonian aspirations to emancipate Serbian nation from the Turks—Participation of Macedonians in Austro-Turkish War (1788–1791) for liberation of the Serbs from the Turks—Participation of Macedonians in the Serbian insurrection under Karageorge and Miloš Obrenović at the beginning of the nineteenth century—Moral support for Serbia from Macedonia—Macedonian national poetry celebrates the struggle of the Serbian nation against the Turks.

IX

BULGARIAN PROPAGANDA IN MACEDONIA. BULGARIAN RESURRECTION 119

Bulgars completely forgotten in Europe after the fall of the Bulgarian Empire in the Middle Ages—Bulgars in Bulgaria without national consciousness—Attempts at national awakening—The Ruthenian G. Venelin forms an idealistic picture of the Bulgars and rouses them—Bulgars, inspired by Venelin's fables, begin to dream of Great Bulgaria—The romantic enthusiast George S. Rakovski fosters Bulgarian megalomania—Stephan Verković and his forged Bulgarian antiquities—All Bulgars united in the conception of their unlimited greatness—Education of the rising generation in this spirit—Bulgarian ideas take hold in Russia—Committees for the propaganda of the Bulgarian idea in Russia—Russian scholars, infected by Bulgarism, become its pioneers—Sympathy for the Bulgars spreads from Russia to the rest of Europe.

IX (*Continued*)

PAGE

BULGARIAN ACTION IN MACEDONIA 134

The Greek Church abuses its power over the Slavs in the Turkish Empire—Slav dissatisfaction—Inability of the Serbs to fight the Greek Church—The Bulgars, assisted by Russia, open their campaign—The Uniate Church (Greek Catholicism) among the Bulgars—The Russians, alarmed at the progress of the Uniate Church, increase their help to the Bulgars—The Greek Patriarch, alarmed at the growth of the Uniate Church, yields to the Bulgars—The Porte, taking the part of the Bulgars, intervenes with the Greek Patriarch, and the Sultan declares the independence of the Bulgarian Church in Turkey—Significance of the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate—Detriment caused to the Serbs in Turkey by the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate—Attitude of the Greek Church towards the Macedonian Serbs—Macedonians begin to turn Uniate—Russia advises them to join the Bulgars in their struggle against the Greek Church—Macedonians help Bulgars, but only to free themselves from the Greek clergy—The Macedo-Roumanians do the same—The Bulgarian Exarchate and Macedonia—Turks side with Bulgars in Macedonia—New Bulgarian bishoprics in Macedonia—Forcible Bulgarization of the Macedonians—Creation of independent Bulgaria—Propaganda in Macedonia from Bulgaria—Many Macedonian Serbs refuse to join the Bulgars—Bulgarian terror among Serbian population of Macedonia—Bulgarian comitadjis in Macedonia—Destruction of Serbian records and monuments in Macedonia.

X

SERBIA AND MACEDONIA 160

Serbia the refuge for the Macedonians—Macedonians accepted as Serbs in Serbia—Macedonians always considered foreigners in Bulgaria—Serbian public opinion looks upon Macedonians as forming part of the Serbian nation—So do Serbia's statesmen—So does Serbian science—Non-Serbian science takes the same view—Serbia welcomes Bulgarian immigrants and assists the Bulgarian Church movement so long as Bulgaria does not lay claim to Macedonia also—Serbia's inability to check

PAGE

Bulgarian encroachment in Macedonia—Serbian interest in Macedonia—Serbian schools opened—Assistance of the Serbian Church movement in Macedonia—Macedonians as guardians of Serbian nationality—Serbian schools in Macedonia—Macedonians petition for a restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate—Failing in this request, they ask for Serbian bishops—Insurrection in Macedonia in favour of annexation to Serbia—Macedonians appeal to Prince Milan of Serbia and to the Congress of Berlin to be permitted to belong to Serbia, and not to Bulgaria—Macedonians' brave fight against Bulgarian comitadjis—In spite of all Bulgarian propaganda the better part of Macedonia remains Serbian—The rest ostensibly sides with the Bulgars.

XI

MACEDONIAN DIALECTS OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE . 188

Language of the Macedonian Slavs originally merely called "Slav"—No mention of Bulgarian language in Macedonia up to the beginning of the nineteenth century—Language of literary records in Macedonia Serbian throughout the Middle Ages—Serbian also in the nineteenth century until the advent of the Bulgarian propaganda—Difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian languages noticed at a very early date—Macedonian idiom not identical in all districts—Insufficiency of linguistic material for thorough study of Macedonian idiom—All Macedonian dialects belong to one type—Macedonian dialects are Serbian—Morphology—Etymology—The article as it appears in Macedonian dialects is not a Bulgarian characteristic.

XII

NATIONAL CUSTOMS 200

Old Slav tribal system completely broken up by Old Bulgarian State system—Tribal system preserved in Macedonia and other Serbian lands—Hence the identity of social conditions and customs—Typically Serbian customs in Macedonia—The "Slava"—Bulgarian campaign against "Slava" in Macedonia—"Preslava"—Village "Slava"—Custom of pilgrimage to Serbian monasteries—Pilgrimages to the Monastery of Dečani.

XIII

PAGE

POPULAR TRADITION 210

Beauty and wealth of Serbian popular tradition—Ethnographic element and historic memories enshrined in it—Macedonia considered a Serbian country by non-Macedonian Serbian popular tradition—National tradition of Macedonia shows a purely Serbian character—Example from beginning of eighteenth century—Examples from the nineteenth century—Folk poetry in Macedonia purely Serbian—Bulgarian collections of Macedonian national poetry reveal purely Serbian characters in spite of touching and editing—Reference to none but Serbian historic events, places, and characters—No reference to Bulgarian historic events, places, and characters—Serbian monasteries famous in Macedonian folk poetry—Serbian names in Macedonian poetry—Language in Macedonian poetry pure Serbian—According to national tradition the liberation and unification of all Serbia is bound up with Macedonia.

XIV

CONCLUSION 226

SUPPLEMENTS

I. STORY OF THE PROGRESS OF THE BULGARIAN CHURCH MOVEMENT, TOLD BY T. HADŽI MIŠEV, OF VELES . 235

II. THE STORY OF JOVAN VELJIĆ, OF DEBAR, TELLING HOW THE BULGARIAN TEACHERS MADE HIM A BULGAR BY FORCE 238

III. STORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BULGARIAN PROPAGANDA IN MACEDONIA, TOLD BY A CITIZEN OF BITOLJ 240

IV. PETITIONS OF MACEDONIANS TO THE SERBIAN PRINCE MILAN AND TO THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN TO BE UNITED WITH SERBIA 245

A. From the districts of Kičevo, Prilep and Veles, with the signatures of 170 mayors, priests, archimandrites, etc., appended and bearing the seals of 44 communes.

B. Petition addressed to Prince Milan, signed by 520 parish councils, etc., from the districts of Kumanovo, Kratovo, Palanka, Ištip, Petrić, Strumica and Kočani, with the seals of 220 communes affixed, drawn up on June 2, 1878, at Kozjak.

C. Petition addressed to the British Consul at Vranje, as Envoy of the Berlin Congress, signed in Vranje, on June 11, 1878, by 20 natives of Gilane (from the towns and villages of Gilane, Pasijan, Petrovac, Ranilug, Ropotovo, Domorovac, Kufedže, Koretište, Stanišor, Budrig, Parteš, Grizimi, Močar, Miganovac, and Businac).

D. Petition of 500 distinguished citizens, archimandrites, priests, teachers, mayors, etc., of the districts of Kičevo, Ochrida, Debar, and Elbasan, with the seals of 308 communes affixed, dated from the Monastery of Čista Prečista in Skrzava at the Sabor (meeting) of June 15, 1878, and addressed to the "King" of Serbia.

E. Petition addressed to the British Consul (Envoy of the Berlin Congress), dated Gilane, June 18, 1878, and signed by 375 distinguished inhabitants from the districts of Gilane, Skoplje, and Tetovo. A footnote accounts for the absence of parish seals by explaining that plundering Circassians and Albanians had taken them away.

F. Petition to the "King" of Serbia, dated Skoplje, June 20, 1878, with the seals of more than 50 communes affixed. Nobody had dared to sign, as of the signatories to the Božinče petition 250 had been arrested in Skoplje alone, of whom only 50 had come out of prison alive. In the face of such intimidation it is truly amazing that the mayors of 50 communes yet had courage to affix their seals.

G. Petition to the Berlin Congress, dated "On the Gjerman Planina, July 1, 1878," bearing 800 signatures and the seals of 196 communes and monasteries from the districts of Kumanovo, Kratovo, Kočani, and Palanka. (An almost identical but far more explicit petition, bearing 350 signatures and 145 seals, was presented to the Prince of Serbia.)

PAGE

V. INCOMPLETE LIST OF BULGARIAN ATTACKS UPON SERBIAN SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS IN MACEDONIA . 254

VI. INCOMPLETE LIST OF SERBS MURDERED BY THE BULGARS OR AGENTS OF THE BULGARIAN COMMITTEE IN MACEDONIA BETWEEN 1881 AND 1909 . 256

VII. INCOMPLETE LIST OF ATTEMPTED MURDERS PERPETRATED BY BULGARS ON SERBS BETWEEN 1897 AND 1901 282

VIII. BULGARIAN PROCLAMATION IN 1879, CALLING UPON THE INHABITANTS OF MACEDONIA TO RISE AGAINST THE TURKS 284

MACEDONIA

I

INTRODUCTION

Confusion as regards definition of Macedonia—Correct conception of Macedonia—Origin of confusion—Subject of this book—Historical and literary sources consulted by the author

ALTHOUGH much has been written about Macedonia, it is not until recent years that any one has succeeded in attaching a correct conception to the term. Hence every writer on the subject of Macedonia extended his own definition to such territorial area as seemed convenient or expedient to him to include within her borders. The widest definition of Macedonia has been furnished by the Bulgars. This is because in the eyes of the Bulgars the frontiers of Macedonia proper are too narrow for their extensive pretensions in the Balkan Peninsula. Several Bulgarian writers have even gone so far as to include practically the whole of the Turkish Empire in Europe under the head of Macedonia. Non-Bulgarian writers on the subject have likewise enlarged the definition of Macedonia, either from ignorance, or out of political consideration for this country or that, or because they took their cue

from the Bulgars, or because it did not occur to them to devote special study to the definition of what ought to be understood under Macedonia, and to establish this by critical investigation.

It is only within recent years that Dr. J. Cvijić, Professor of Geography at the University of Belgrade, has, as the result of many years' travelling in Macedonia and exhaustive study of all the literary records in the country, established beyond all doubt that the central part of Macedonia extends to the middle (below Skoplje) and lower reaches of the Vardar; that her territory extends westward to the great lakes of Ochrida and Prespa, and eastward to the River Struma and, in places, to the River Mesta. Consequently the territorial unit of Macedonia would include the regions around Ochrida, Bitolj, Voden, Salonica, Dojran, Strumica, Seres, and Kavala. All else to the north of this is not Macedonia.

In order to make the matter quite clear we shall quote some of the reasons given by Mr. Cvijić. But in order to deprecate criticism, we will quote only those of Mr. Cvijić's arguments, touching which it cannot possibly be laid to his charge that they are the biassed expression of a Serbian patriot of the present day, and which are consequently beyond cavil. In establishing the territorial extent of Macedonia, Mr. Cvijić has among other material consulted the old maps published up to within the first decades of the nineteenth century, when there were as yet no nationalist discussions over the frontiers of the Balkan peoples and when the statements of scientific geographers rested on facts alone.

"From the time," says Mr. Cvijić, "when in the sixteenth century better and more complete geographical maps of the European countries began to appear, and

right up to the eighteenth century the most reliable maps of the Balkan Peninsula are the Italian. After these come Mercator's map and the maps by the Royal French Geographers. On all these maps the name of *Serbia* extends over the regions south of the Šar Mountain and the Skoplje Crna Gora. On the map drawn by the Italian geographer Giac. Gastaldi, in 1566, Serbia includes not only Kosovo Polje and Skoplje itself but also the regions around Skoplje. On many maps drawn by the official 'Geographer of the Republic of Venice,' the famous V. Coronelli, in 1692 (in the 'Corso Geografico'), Serbia is shown as extending south of the Šar Mountain and the Skoplje Crna Gora. In those maps we practically always find the legend 'Metropoli della Serbia' beside the name of Skoplje. On many French seventeenth-century maps drawn by the 'Royal Géographers,' Serbia includes not only Novi Pazar and Prizren, but also the surroundings of Skoplje in the wider sense. Similar frontiers are also assigned to Serbia in the maps by F. de Witt, in the maps in the atlases by Blaeu and H. Moll, and in many others of the second half of the seventeenth century. In numerous maps by the well-known cartographer, Joh. Bapt. Homann, dating from the first half of the eighteenth century, the districts of Skoplje, Kratovo, and Ćustendil are included in Serbia, and the frontier of Macedonia runs considerably south of Skoplje. In the maps published in Nuremberg by Homann's Successors at the beginning of the nineteenth century (in 1802, 1805, etc.) Serbia includes not only the regions of Novi Pazar and Kosovo, but also those of Skoplje and Kratovo. Similarly wide frontiers are also assigned to Serbia in the books of the Serbian historian J. Rajić (eighteenth century), by the geographer P.

Solarić, and by the father of Serbian literature, Vuk. S. Karadžić (nineteenth century). In the map published by S. Tekelja in 1805, the wider frontiers of Serbia, as understood up to the time of the liberation, are shown in detail. Serbia is made to include Prizren, Priština, Vučitru (the whole of Kosovo), Skoplje, Kratovo, Ćustendil, Pirot, and Caribrod. In the 'Geography of Serbia,' by Baron Rotkirch, translated into Serbian and the map copied by Stephan Milošević in 1822, we find the wider frontiers of Serbia, as also in the map by Fried of Vienna in which the Serbian frontier runs south-east of Ćustendil.

"These remarks apply to all the more important geographical handbooks in which Serbia is mentioned and her frontiers are given. Similar instances and proofs from the earlier cartographers could be tripled. It is a well-known fact, moreover, that this definition of Serbia was not merely a cartographic and literary conception, but one that lived in the minds of the inhabitants, since persons from those regions (Kratovo, Skoplje, Ovce Polje, etc.) described their native districts as 'Serbian countries.' Thus it is quite natural that after the liberation of Serbia these regions were called Old Serbia, in order to distinguish them from the Principality. . . . I know of no map drawn prior to the liberation of Serbia in which the above-mentioned regions are included in Macedonia; and this applies even to those districts across which the name of Serbia is not indicated. In many of the above-mentioned maps the name Macedonia is indicated across the counties extending from the Skoplje southern frontier of Serbia, along the Vardar and up to Salonica. Macedonia therefore includes mainly the middle and lower reaches of the

Vardar, the regions around the Great Lakes in the west, and as far as the Struma and (in places) as far as the Struma and (in places) as far as the Mesta in the east."[1]

From the foregoing it is clear what was formerly understood under the name of Macedonia. The confusion of ideas with regard to her territorial extent is a thing of recent growth. The liberation of Serbia and Greece has entailed many changes in the geographical conceptions of the Balkan Peninsula. "Cartographers are confused because the old geographical names have ceased to tally with the names of new States. Even the Balkan Peninsula has been without a name since then, for the whole of its extent had been called 'the Ottoman Empire in Europe,' 'European Turkey,' etc., because with small exceptions it all belonged to Turkey. In 1808 the German geographer Zeune, writing in the periodical *Gaea*, gave the Balkan Peninsula the name of 'Hämushalbinsel,'. which term was subsequently modernized into 'Balkan Peninsula.' At that time, when names were being invented for the Balkan Peninsula and its countries, the cartographers began gradually to eliminate from the map the broader conception of Serbia and to apply this name only to the liberated political Serbia. Simultaneously the indication of Macedonia began to be extended on the maps. . . . Sporadically, however, the broader conception of Serbia was preserved throughout the earlier half of the nineteenth century."[2]

[1] J. Cvijić, "Geografski Položaj Makedonije i Stare Srbije" ("Geographical Conditions of Macedonia and Old Serbia"), "Srpski Književni Glasnik," vol. xi., 1904, pp. 208–212.

[2] J. Cvijić, ibid., pp. 210–211.

With such confusion prevailing in the ranks of the professional cartographers with regard to the definition of Macedonia, it is not to be wondered at that the Bulgarian "patriots," politicians with an axe to grind, and others imperfectly acquainted with the facts, put forward the most extravagant claims as regards the territorial conception of Macedonia.

If matters had stood thus merely as regards the physical area of Macedonia, it would still be quite simple to apply that name only to the territory within her true frontiers, since all that lies outside these frontiers, not forming part of Macedonia, would not enter into the discussion. But as by the enlarged conception of Macedonia everything else included in this conception has become involved in it, it has become necessary to deal with everything together. This is the *only* reason why in this book the term Macedonia is to be understood as applying not only to Macedonia proper, but also to a great part of Old Serbia to which the enlarged definition of Macedonia has been extended, and which the Bulgars have claimed—like everything else wherever possible—as coming within the scope of their aspirations.

In writing this book we have therefore—although incorrectly—for the nonce adopted the conception of Macedonia according to the Bulgarian definition, viz. as the territory extending from the Bulgarian State frontiers to the Šar Mountain, to the River Drim, to the Gulf of Salonica, and to the River Mesta.

* * * * *

The object of this book is to furnish a trustworthy account of what the Macedonians are as to their origin, what they were in the past, what they are to-day, and

how the present confusion arose, until the true position of affairs was forgotten and the "Macedonian Question" created. In collecting material concerning this Question I did my best to consult only the most reliable sources and the best authorities on Macedonia.

Historical sources conveying information on the subject are limited in number. I have restricted myself to such as are unquestionably reliable. Doubtful historical sources I have been careful to reject. I have been specially cautious in my attitude towards the casual notes of foreign travellers in the Balkan Peninsula. Ignorant of the history, ignorant of the circumstances, ignorant of the language, they have included statements in their books which are amazing in their inaccuracy. Already in 1857, G. S. Rakovski, one of the greatest Bulgarian chauvinists, called the notes of such travellers "poetic imaginations," and "tales from the 'Arabian Nights,'" whenever he found their contents unfavourable to the Bulgars. But the Bulgars soon forgot these strictures, and whenever the notes of foreign traveller-authors are favourable to them at the expense of the Serbs and Greeks, they quote them abundantly. Some travellers have gone so far as to say that Kosovo Polje, Prizren, and Novi Pazar are in Bulgaria, and the Bulgars have greedily seized upon these statements and backed them up with their own assertions that Macedonia is Bulgarian. I desired my statements to be on a different level, and have therefore been on my guard against similar misstatements, although I have frequently found it asserted in books of travel that not only is Macedonia inhabited by Serbs, but that Philippopolis is "one of the oldest Serbian cities" ("une des plus anciennes villes de la Servie")! Historic data of this type prove nothing

in favour of either Serbs or Bulgars. They are utterly valueless.

Much has been written about Macedonia, and out of all this material I have striven to use only the best. The Bulgars especially have written voluminously upon the subject; it was necessary for them to convince the world by hook or by crook that Macedonia is Bulgarian, and they have been indefatigable in writing about her. Bulgarian literature dealing with Macedonia falls into two categories.

The first of these consists of a host of insignificant small books and pamphlets, printed on vile paper in bad type, written in a style and form which are beneath criticism and padded with arguments beyond the comprehension of sane men. They have been written and published by half-educated, unlettered Bulgarian priests, teachers, and small clerks from villages and townships buried away in the interior, and their purpose is to convince the Bulgarian lower classes that Macedonia is Bulgarian. This literature does not merit serious consideration.

The second category consists of large volumes, printed in superior type on superfine paper, written in pretentious style and form and aggressive in argument. These books bear on their title-pages the names of University professors, members of academies, doctors of philosophy, scientific and political men, and they are written sometimes in Bulgarian and sometimes in a foreign tongue. Those written in Bulgarian pursue the object of showing how deeply the Bulgarian "high circles" are interested in Macedonia. Those written in a foreign tongue have the task of enlightening public opinion in Europe on the subject of Bulgaria's rights to Macedonia. Hence these

books are furnished with references, illustrations, and maps. Very often more than one-half of the book consists of supplements. These books are distinctly interesting. Ever mindful of their aim and of the knowledge that foreigners cannot check their statements to a sufficient extent, their authors have ladled in everything that could be made effective. The better to reinforce Bulgaria's claim to Macedonia, these books include not only the latter, but half Serbia in "Bulgaria." In their pages the heroes of Serbian history are "Bulgars"; so are the liberators of Serbia, and the present population of Serbia as well. These volumes, too, abound in irrelevancies and puerilities. In one of the most recent of them,[1] for instance, we find it asserted that in 1878 the Serbs in extending the frontiers of Serbia encroached upon Bulgarian rights, and subsequently in their new provinces "Serbicized" the Bulgarian place-names. As an example of this Leskovec is quoted, which the Serbs are accused of having renamed Leskovac. In the meantime the texts dating from 1836 to 1838, 1841, 1858, and 1861, and quoted as supplements in the said book, and all the maps from between 1853 to 1878, which are likewise given, invariably give the name of the town in its Serbian form of *Leskovac*, and not once in its Bulgarian form of *Leskovec*. It takes courage to make these allegations! The supplements and notes to these books are likewise interesting. If even a single word of their text is favourable to Bulgarian pretensions, they are

[1] A. Ishirkov, Docteur ès lettres, Professeur de Géographie à l'Université de Sofia, Membre de l'Académie Bulgare des Sciences, etc. "Les confins occidentaux des Terres Bulgares," Lausanne, 1916, pp. 119, 183, 189, 194, 202.

quoted to the public as gospel truth, regardless of their authorship, their meaning, their correctness (or lack of it), and whether they contain statements such as that "the Morava rises in Bosnia," that "Nish is the capital of Bulgaria," that "Ćustendil is not far from Prokuplje near the Morava valley," or that "Prizren and Novi Pazar are in Bulgaria"! This literature, too, does not merit serious consideration.

Non-Bulgarian literature dealing with Macedonia is likewise extensive. In the first place we have the Russian writers on the subject. The Bulgars are Russia's children. The Russians at the beginning of the nineteenth century discovered the moribund Bulgarian nation, revealed it to the world, fostered it, reared it, and spoiled it as a parent spoils a sickly and wayward child. Of Russian sympathies for the Bulgars more will be said in another part of this book. Here I will merely mention that beside and behind these sympathies for the Bulgars there was also the question of Russia's political interests. Russia looked upon Bulgaria as a lever and an annexe for her political aims in the Balkan Peninsula. Bulgarian pretensions in the Balkans went hand in hand with Russian interests. The greater Bulgaria, the stronger Russia's lever in the Balkans. Hence in Russian literature, Bulgarian territory extends to the limits claimed for it by the Bulgars.

Finally, other foreigners have written about Macedonia. This literature, too, is very varied. There are books in which all knowledge of the subject is conspicuous by its absence. There are some which are inspired by weak-kneed sympathy for the small and insignificant nation of the Bulgars. In some cases the

authors have been misled by following in the wake of other writers. In others the books have been written to order for Bulgaria or the authors were in Bulgarian pay. Very few of the books upon Macedonia have been written with real knowledge of the subject, impartially, independently, and honestly.

I have endeavoured to be as careful in selecting my literary data as I have been in choosing my historical sources. Of the huge mass of literature on Macedonia I have consulted only such works as are above reproach.

Throughout my work I have had but one aim before me—to be unbiassed, to set forth the truth so as to disarm criticism—even from the Bulgarian side. I have therefore made some concessions to the Bulgars. In the first place I have—against my personal conviction—extended the territory of Macedonia to the limits claimed by the Bulgars; I have consulted their literature so far as it was possible to do so; and finally in my chapter on national tradition in Macedonia I have consulted no collections of Macedonian national tradition, but such as have been compiled by the Bulgars themselves in Macedonia.

This book is written far from Serbian scientific centres and libraries. There remain, therefore, some books and references I was not able to consult for my work, and which would have thrown the statements in this book into stronger relief, and have shed a clearer light upon the malpractices and dishonesty of the Bulgars with regard to their seizure of Serbian Macedonia.

II

THE SOUTHERN SLAVS

The Southern Slavs and their arrival in their present territory—Ethnographic changes brought about by their arrival—Ethnical unity of the Southern Slavs—The Bulgars and their invasion of the Southern Slav lands between the Danube and the Balkan mountains—Contrast between the Bulgars and the conquered Slavs—Their gradual fusion into the present Bulgarian nation—Traces of old Bulgarian qualities in the modern Bulgars—Territory in which the present Bulgarian nation was evolved

THE Southern Slavs are a branch of the great Slav group of nations. On leaving the main body of the Slav community the Southern Slavs first remained for a long time in Central Europe in the plains between the Carpathians and the Alps. Beginning in the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Justinus (518–527) and continuing up to that of Heraclius (610–641), they gradually crossed the Save and the Danube into the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire, until they finally spread over the whole territory from the Alps to the Carpathians in the north, to the Morea in the south, the Adriatic in the west, and the Ægean and Black Seas in the east.

With the arrival of the Southern Slavs great ethnographic changes took place in the Balkan Peninsula. The ancient Greek inhabitants who lived principally in the eastern and southern parts of the Balkan Peninsula

were pressed to the eastern and southern extremities of the Peninsula. The remnant of the ancient Illyrians who inhabited the western part of the Peninsula, were driven farther into the mountains and intermingled with the numerous Slav settlers there. The Roman colonists still remaining in the Peninsula were gradually absorbed by the Slav masses or survived to any great extent only in those regions where the Slav tide of invasion was less strong, as in Thessaly and South Macedonia (Tsintsars or Macedo-Roumanians) and in Dacia (Roumanians). Thus throughout the Balkan Peninsula and far to the north of it the Southern Slavs became the principal ethnic element.

This whole group of Slavs, extending from the Alps to the Carpathians across the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, went by this common name of Slavs. Thus they are so called by the Greek and Latin writers both at the time of their immigration and for a long time afterwards. The territory in which they settled was called *Slavinia* (Σκλαβινίαι, Sclavinia, Sclavonia, or—rarely—Sclavinica). The name of Slavs for the nation and that of Slavinia for their country, was retained by the Southern Slavs for a very long time. There is a province between the Rivers Drave and Save which is called Slavonia to this day. Apart from the Southern Slavs themselves, the name of Slavs as applied to the Southern Slav nation has survived also among the Roumanians and Albanians to this day.[1]

The Southern Slavs were in every respect one nation. Besides having the name in common, they bore also every other sign of being one nation. They spoke one

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," t. i., Gotha, 1911, pp. 113–114.

language, they all possessed the same type of civilization, the same religion, the same customs. Their social life was also everywhere the same. They lived mostly in villages; their occupations were farming and cattle-rearing. Urban civilization and social life were as yet unknown to them. Their social structure was in keeping with their primitive mode of life, and was organized on the tribal system. Each Southern Slav tribe or clan formed a separate body bearing its own special name. The head of the clan assisted by the tribal council conducted the internal affairs of the clan and regulated the relations between his own clan and its neighbours. They had nothing resembling a State or commonwealth as yet. The southern and more numerous division of the Southern Slavs acknowledged the suzerainty of Byzantium, the northern and lesser division owned the sway of the Avars. The tribal chiefs or princes were semi-independent towards the suzerain State, and its power was not greatly felt by the tribes.

The organized State did not arise everywhere at the same time among the Southern Slavs. Their first native State arose during the second half of the seventh century and among the northern branch of the Southern Slavs, the ancestors of the Slovenes of to-day, under the leadership of the native tribal princes. Towards the end of the eighth century and in the beginning of the ninth the Croatian State emerged on the shores of the Adriatic. About the same time the Serbian State appeared in the mountainous regions around the Rivers Drina, Ibar, and Lim. The Macedonian Slavs, as we shall see, built up their State rather later. All these States the Southern Slavs built up unaided, under the leadership of native princes and chieftains, free from all foreign influence.

Only one branch of the Southern Slavs met with a different fate. It was doomed, soon after its immigration, to fall under the sway of an alien people, to link its fate with it, to modify its civilization, its social structure, and the whole of its existence. This was that branch of the Southern Slavs which took possession of the Balkan country, bounded by the Danube in the north and the Balkan mountains in the south, the River Iskar in the west, and the Black Sea in the east. In that area eight Southern Slav clans had settled. They formed part of the rest of the Southern Slavs, with whom they shared the same language and civilization, religion, and social system. In the year 679 they were invaded by a nomad people with a martial organization and of Turanian origin, called the Bulgars. Like a hurricane the Bulgars overran the peaceful Slav tribes settled between the Danube and the Balkan mountains and established their State in that territory.

While the ethnological problem of all other Southern Slavs is quite simple and straightforward as we have seen, that of those Southern Slavs who were invaded by the Bulgars is far more complex. It is therefore necessary to add some further explanation concerning this last-named branch of the Southern Slavs. These remarks will at the same time explain the huge difference between the Bulgars of to-day and all the rest of the Southern Slavs.

Between the Bulgarian conquerors and the Slavs who had to submit to them there was a vast difference. The Bulgars were Mongols. The conquered Southern Slavs were Indo-Europeans. Differing as regards race, they also possessed radically differing languages. In fact, they belonged to two totally different nations, with

different forms of civilization. The Bulgars were nomads; the conquered Southern Slavs were settled farmers and keepers of cattle. The Bulgars were a nation of conquerors with a martial organization with the central authority in the hands of the ruler; the conquered Southern Slavs were pacific, divided into clans, a nation loosely knit together without political unity. The Bulgars possessed a State structure; to the conquered Southern Slavs the self-contained State was yet unknown. The Bulgars owned a despotic rule; the conquered Southern Slavs had a democratic, tribal administration, in which the tribal assemblies took part. The religion and customs of the Bulgars differed from those of the conquered Southern Slavs. The Bulgars burned their dead or buried them in grave-mounds together with their living wives and slaves; the Southern Slavs, although they sometimes burned their dead, never sacrificed the family and slaves of the deceased. The Bulgars practised polygamy — their Boyards (princes) had whole harems; among the Southern Slavs polygamy was very rare. Bulgarian justice was barbarous in the extreme. If one of the boyards rebelled and was defeated, then not only was he deprived of his life and possessions, but his children and all his kinsfolk were put to death; among the Southern Slavs the penalties were humane, and sentence had to be passed by the assembly. The Bulgars lived in war and for war; the Southern Slavs only went to war when they were attacked. The war customs of the Bulgars were cruel; they made the skulls of their conquered enemies into goblets from which they quaffed wine at their banquets; the Southern Slavs were magnanimous to their foes both during and after the war.

In time of peace with Byzantium the Bulgars sold Slav boys and girls in the slave market; the Southern Slavs held such a trade in abhorrence. The Bulgars and the conquered Southern Slavs represented two distinct races, with two distinct languages and two totally distinct civilizations. The vast difference between the Bulgars and the Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula in the sixth and seventh centuries, as described by the Byzantine historians Procopius and Maurikios, has also been emphatically insisted on by Const. Jireček, the best Bulgarian historian.[1]

The Bulgars were greatly inferior in numbers to the conquered Southern Slavs. They owed their victory over the Southern Slavs solely to their martial organization and brute force.

The conquered Southern Slavs had no love for their conquerors. Their hatred is easy to understand when one considers the contrast between them. An old Russian chronicler of the eleventh century knows that the Bulgars "terrorized the conquered Slavs." Many of the Slav tribes opposed a determined resistance to the Bulgars. When the Bulgars attacked the Slav tribe living by the River Timok, these Slavs abandoned their home by the Timok rather than submit to the Bulgars.

But in spite of all divergencies and all hates, closer relations gradually supervened between the Bulgars and the conquered Slavs—mutual influence, adaptation, and finally the fusion into one nation. The old name of Turanian conquerors—*Bulgars*—became the general name for this mixed Turano-Slav nation.

The Bulgars gradually settled down in their new

[1] Const. Jireček, "Geschichte der Bulgaren," Prague, 1876, pp. 131–134.

territory among the conquered Southern Slavs. From being nomads they became a settled people like the Slavs. As the Bulgars were in the minority, they were in many things compelled to adapt themselves to the Slav majority. They took up the agricultural pursuits of the Slavs. The Bulgars also familiarized themselves with the customs and civilization of the Slavs. Finally, the Bulgarian language gradually disappeared, until it was completely ousted by the Slav tongue. The fusion of the Bulgars and the conquered Southern Slavs was fairly rapid; within two hundred and fifty years the process was complete. The Bulgarian nobility, who were very exclusive, of course amalgamated less easily than the small number of Bulgarian commons who lived scattered among the conquered Slavs; but even the Bulgarian nobility yielded little by little. Already in 812 we find a Bulgarian envoy to Constantinople bearing the Slav name of Dragomir, and about the middle of the ninth century Slav names occur even among members of the princely families.

Such was the influence of the Southern Slavs upon the Bulgars. But the Bulgars, too, have left traces of their influence upon the conquered Slavs. Physical and moral qualities are not so easily modified as the manner of living, occupation, custom, and language of a race. The physique of the modern Bulgars is very striking. They are, as a matter of fact, no longer Mongols, but certain Mongol features appear at the first glance. Their short stature, their well-built but thick-set figure, their very pronounced roundness of face—all are features which distinguish the Bulgars from the true Southern Slavs. They are the survival of the Mongolian type in the Bulgarian physique. The moral qualities of the Turanian

Bulgar, can also be traced in the Bulgars of to-day. These qualities are no longer unalloyed, as among the ancient Bulgars, but in the main they are still there. The insatiable lust of possession which characterized the Bulgars when they first came to the Peninsula is still equally strong in the Slavicized Bulgars. The only difference is that whereas the Turanian Bulgars were an intrepid warrior horde, the Slav Bulgars are insatiable grabbers only when there is a prospect of profit without risk. The old Turanian cruelty and brutality towards all and sundry has persisted in their mixed descendants only for the benefit of those who are weaker than themselves; towards their superiors in strength these qualities are toned down even to servility. The traces of the mental and moral qualities of the Turanian Bulgars we find clearly and consistently expressed through the whole of Bulgarian history, both remote and recent. We can recognize them in every description of the modern Bulgar, no matter whether the description be furnished by the Bulgars themselves or by foreigners. We can trace them finally also in the Bulgarian attitude during the great World War.

There is one more legacy from their Turanian antiquity, which distinguished the Bulgars from the Southern Slavs from the very first day of their life in the Balkan Peninsula, and which completely distinguishes their Turano-Slav descendants to this day from the true Southern Slavs; that is their social organization. Their State structure, which the Bulgars brought with them and transplanted among the conquered Slavs, destroyed for good every trace of the Slav tribal organization. During the course of their history the State organization of the Bulgars sometimes declined, but the

destroyed tribal organization of the Slavs in Bulgaria never revived. With the tribal organization all those social customs which have their origin in the clan, the gens, and the family likewise disappeared in Bulgaria. While in all other Southern Slav countries there are preserved to this day either the remains of the old division into clans or tribes, and even the tribal organization or at least recent memories of them, together with the customs which refer to the clan, the gens, and family, in Bulgaria all this disappeared very early and left no trace. But whereas in Bulgaria the very names of the clans have been lost, in Macedonia there were not only clans in olden times,[1] but they can be traced there to this day.[2] The difference between Bulgaria and Macedonia in this respect was already pointed out in 1848 by the Russian savant V. Grigorovič. After quoting the names of clans which exist to-day in Macedonia, he adds that the Bulgars "have no tribal names."[3]

Such are the Bulgars, and such are the differences between them and the rest of the Southern Slavs. The Slav language, which the Bulgars adopted from the conquered Slavs, is the only feature on the strength of

[1] Concerning the Slav tribes in Macedonia after the immigration of the Southern Slavs, see B. Prokić, "Postanak jedne slovenske carevine u Makedoniji" ("Rise of a Slav Empire in Macedonia"), "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akadenije," vol. lvi. pp. 294–297, quoting from Byzantine sources the following names of Slav clans in Macedonia: Brsjaci, Dragovići, Sagudati, Velegostići, Vojinići, Rinkini, Strumljani, and Smoljani.

[2] To this day the districts are accurately known in Macedonia which are inhabited by the following clans: Brsjaci, Mrvaci, Šopovi, Polivaci, Babuni, Keckari, and Mijaci (V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestviji, po evropejskoj Turciji" ("Sketches by a Traveller in European Turkey"), Kazan, 1848, p. 196.

[3] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk," p. 196.

which they have been included in the Slav group of nations. As far as other things are concerned, there would be no place for them there.

The territory which saw the process of the evolution of the Bulgarian nation was the very same as that which the Turanian Bulgars occupied when they first came to the Balkan Peninsula. It did not extend farther west than the River Iskar in Modern Bulgaria, nor farther south than to the Balkan Chain. Until the year 800 Bulgaria was bounded in the west by the River Iskar, and before 861 it did not extend beyond the Balkan Chain. At first the Bulgarian capital was Pliskov, to the north-east of Šumen of to-day in Bulgaria. Later on it was Preslav, on the northern slopes of the Balkan Chain.[1] There was the first Bulgarian State, and there the assimilation between Bulgars and Slavs took place; there the Bulgarian nation was created, and there it remains to this day, clearly distinct in all its qualities from the rest of the Southern Slavs. The difference between the Bulgars within their well-defined frontiers and the Slavs beyond those frontiers was observed very early by the Byzantine writers. They speak of the Southern Slav territory between the Adriatic and the Rhodope mountains as *Slavinia* (Σκλαβινία), in order to distinguish it from *Bulgaria*, and they refer to the inhabitants of the former country as *Slavs*, in order to distinguish them from the Bulgars.[2]

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. pp. 189–190.

[2] B. Prokić, "Postanak jedne slovenske carevine u Makedoniji," pp. 299–300. C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 194.

III

THE MACEDONIAN STATE

The Macedonian Slavs—Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Contrast between the Bulgars and the Macedonian Slavs—Adverse conditions under the Bulgars—Revolt of the Macedonian Slavs and emancipation from the Bulgars—Renewal of Byzantine domination in Macedonia—Revolt and emancipation from Byzantium—The Macedonian State—Its rise—Frontiers—Name of the Macedonian State

THE Macedonian Slavs, as we have seen, are merely a branch of the Southern Slavs. But while the Southern Slav States of Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia were being built up in the countries north of Macedonia, and the Bulgarian State and nation resulted from the amalgamation of the Southern Slavs between the Danube and the Balkan Chain with their conquerors, the Macedonian Slavs still remained under the domination of the Byzantine Empire. The Byzantine writers invariably refer to them as "Slavs," or the "Slav nation" (τὸ τῶν Σκλαβίνων ἔθνος). They still lived mainly in villages; they were an agricultural people, and retained their primitive tribal organization. The Byzantine writers say that the territories occupied by the individual tribes in Macedonia were called "Slovenia" (Σκλαβινίαι), and that each tribe had a semi-independent prince (ἄρχον). The dignity of these princes was hereditary, and they were quite independent as regards the internal management of the

tribe. They acknowledged only the suzerainty of the Greek Empire, and they paid a fixed tribute.

Beside the above-mentioned common name of "Slavs" in Macedonia, the name of "Serbs" is also mentioned at a very early date. Serbs are also mentioned among the Slavs of Macedonia (between the Struma and Vardar Rivers), who were subdued by the Byzantine Emperor Constantin III in 649 and sent to Asia Minor. The town of *Gordoserba*, in Bithynia, was named after them, and it used to be the seat of a Bishopric.[1] Some time about 950 the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus wrote that the town of *τα Σερβλία*, in the district of Salonica, at the foot of Olympus, derives its name from the Serbs who originally settled there.[2]

Towards the middle of the ninth century the Bulgars began to attack Byzantium in the direction of Macedonia. About the year 861, under their Tsar Boris (852–888), they conquered part of Macedonia. By the wars waged by the Bulgarian Tsar Simeon (893–927) against Byzantium, the Bulgars succeeded in gaining possession of the whole of Macedonia.

Coming in this manner under the sway of the Bulgars, the Macedonian Slavs maintained the same relations towards them which they had hitherto observed towards Byzantium. The Slav tribes, under the rule of their native princes or chieftains, retained their independent domestic organization, only their allegiance was transferred to their new masters. The change of allegiance did not, therefore, interfere with the domestic life of

[1] St. Stanojević, "Vizantija i Srbi" ("Byzantium and the Serbs"), t. ii., N. Sad, 1896, pp. 41 and 215.

[2] Const. Porphyrogenitus, "De administrando imperio," cap. 32, p. 152, ed. Bonn.

the Macedonian Slavs. Likewise it exercised no influence on the ethnical evolution of the Macedonians either. The Bulgars did not come as settlers, but as conquerors. As only the towns [1] in which the whole of their military strength was concentrated came under their direct rule, they never came into contact with the Macedonian Slavs; because in the towns the population was preponderantly Greek and not Slav.

The lot of the Macedonian Slavs under the Bulgars was not a pleasant one. The Bulgars and the Macedonian Slavs represented not only two social classes one of which was the ruling and the other the ruled, but also two nations, two religions, and two civilizations. It is true that the Bulgars had already approximated themselves considerably to the conquered Slavs in Bulgarian territory, but to all intents and purposes they were in the main Bulgars. Although they were nominally converted, they were far from being really Christians. Even in 968 a Bulgarian envoy in Constantinople wore his hair cut in the Barbarian style like an "Ungar"; he wore an iron chain, and he was a catechumen not yet baptized. Brought up under the influence of still unsoftened barbarous Turanian qualities, the Bulgars were not popular masters with the peaceable Slavs of the cultivated and prosperous Macedonian provinces of Byzantium, whose ancient intellectual centres were Salonica, Justiniana Prima, and other cities.

Dissatisfaction with the Bulgarian rule manifested itself very early among the Macedonian Slavs. Two insurrections, one in 929 and a second in 931, although

[1] B. Prokić, "Postanak jedne slovenske carevine u Makedoniji" ("Rise of a Slav Empire in Macedonia"), pp. 287–288.

unsuccessful, show clearly what were the feelings of the Macedonian Slavs towards the Bulgarian conquerors. A third insurrection broke out in 969. The leaders of this insurrection were four brothers, sons of a Slav prince in Macedonia. This insurrection was finally successful, and the Macedonian Slavs drove out the Bulgars and established an independent State of their own. In 973 the young Macedonian State fell once more under the domination of Byzantium; but already in 976 the same four brothers who freed Macedonia from the Bulgars succeeded in liberating her from the Greeks. Macedonia once more became independent, and one of the four brothers, Samuel by name, proclaimed himself Tsar (976–1014). Thus by the end of the tenth century the Macedonian Slavs had likewise established their State.

Young, fresh and full of energy, the new Southern Slav State expanded rapidly. In 986 Tsar Samuel successfully deprived Byzantium of Bulgaria, which the Byzantine Emperor John Zimisces had added to his empire in 971. Hereafter Samuel conquered Albania, and then the Serbian States of Duklja, Zeta, and eventually Travunia, Zahumlje, Neretva, Raška, and Bosnia. The frontiers of Samuel's State comprised all the Serbian principalities and the whole of Bulgaria.

Over so vast an empire Samuel failed to maintain his hold. Bulgaria remained in his hands only for fourteen years (986–1000). Then Byzantium wrested it from Samuel and reconquered it.

As ruler over the greater part of the conquered Serbian States Samuel appointed Jovan Vladimir, the deposed Serbian Prince of Zeta and Duklja, after giving him his daughter to wife. Samuel retained only

Macedonia and the countries directly adjoining the principality.

The Bulgars, as we have seen, were for a certain time masters of Macedonia; but on the strength of this rule of theirs the Bulgars are scarcely entitled to lay claim to Macedonia. On the contrary, the Macedonians always looked upon the Bulgars as foreign conquerors; they rebelled against them and drove them out. The Macedonian Empire which the Macedonians built up after emancipating themselves from the Greeks by their own efforts has no connection whatever with the Bulgars except that Bulgaria also was subject to it for a time. After that Bulgaria came under Byzantium, and Macedonia remained a purely Southern Slav native State.

Between Bulgaria and this independent Macedonian Empire there is no connection at all. They are two distinct States as regards population and origin, capital towns, and tendencies. The population of Bulgaria is a mixture of Turanian Bulgars and Slavs, and that of Macedonia is as purely Southern Slav as that of Serbia, Croatia, and the Slovene lands. The Bulgarian State was founded by the Bulgarian conquerors, that of Macedonia by the Slavs who desired to emancipate themselves from both Bulgaria and Byzantium. Bulgaria had her capitals in Pliskov and Preslava, north of the Balkan Chain; the capitals of the Macedonian Empire were Ochrida and Prespa on the lakes of Prespa and Ochrida.

But the Macedonian Empire was called Bulgaria. It is necessary to explain this seeming paradox. It arose from a special cause and has its logical justification. It was a legacy of the Bulgarian Empire name in Macedonia—the legacy of a bygone mastery and an historic tradition.

In 971 the Byzantine Emperor John Zimisces subdued the whole of Bulgaria, whose empire at that time included Macedonia. When immediately afterwards Macedonia, without Bulgaria, freed herself from Byzantium, she assumed the name of Bulgaria, because she aspired to take over the heritage of fallen Bulgaria. Before her downfall Bulgaria ranked as an Empire; her rulers bore the imperial title, and were the upholders of an imperial policy and tradition. This heritage was vacant. Macedonia required immediate recognition and respect, and so took over the Bulgarian name and claims; she assumed even before conquering Bulgaria, and retained them later on after having lost her.

Thus it came about that the Macedonian Empire styled itself Bulgaria. The name of the State is always stronger than the name of the nation.[1] In this case also it was transferred from the State to the nation. This is why foreign writers from that time onward began to refer to the Southern Slavs of Macedonia as Bulgars also.

Instances of young states usurping the name and heritage of other, older states are not infrequent in history. At the very same time when the Macedonian Empire was founded the German Emperors were building up a German Empire in outlying provinces of what had been the ancient Empire of Rome. They, too, appropriated the attributes of a former empire. They named their State the "Roman Empire" and styled themselves "Roman Emperors." The Byzantine Empire was only part of the ancient Roman Empire; nevertheless, down to its fall it styled itself the "Roman Empire," and its emperors called them-

[1] "Stärker als der Volksname war und ist immer der Name des Staates" (C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Bulgaren," p. 138).

selves "Roman Emperors." The Greek inhabitants of this "Roman Empire" called themselves "Romans" (Ρωμαῖοι). And just as the Roman name of the German and Greek Empires has no connection with the Romans, so the Bulgarian name in Macedonia has nothing to do with the Bulgars. All these names are only a memento of the empire whose heritage was assumed by those who bore them.

In the meantime a distinction has always been drawn between the population of Bulgaria and that of Macedonia. Dukljanin, the priest who wrote his Chronicle at Bar (Antivari) in the eleventh century, calls the Macedonians of Samuel's Empire "*Bulgarini*" [1] and refers to the Bulgars by their proper name of "*Bulgari.*" [2] In the German chronicles and elsewhere the Macedonians are often called "Bulgarii" (Bulgariorum) and the Bulgars "Bulgari" (Bulgarorum).[3]

Finally, the Macedonians never in olden times called themselves Bulgars. Dr. V. Gjerić, Professor at the University of Belgrade, after an exhaustive study of all the records referring to the Macedonian Slavs from the earliest times, came to the conclusion that "from the oldest times down to the beginning of the nineteenth century there is not one reliable instance of the Macedonians calling themselves Bulgars or their language the Bulgarian.[4]

[1] "Samuel Bulgarinorum Imperator" I. Crnčić, "Popa Dukljanina Letopis" ("Pop Dukljanin's Chronicle"), Kraljevica, 1874, p. 41.

[2] "Eo tempore (968) defunctus est Bulgarorum Imperator Petrus nomine" (Ibid., p. 38).

[3] B. Prokić, "Postanak jedne slovenske carevine u Makedoniji" ("Rise of a Slav Empire in Macedonia"), p. 320.

[4] Dr. V. Gjerić, "O srpskom imenu u Staroj Srbiji i Makedoniji" ("The term 'Serbian' in Old Serbia and Macedonia"), Belgrade, 1904, p. 42.

IV

BULGARIAN RULE IN MACEDONIA

Subjugation of the Macedonian State by Byzantium in 1018—Bulgars shake off the Byzantine yoke in 1186—Second Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Macedonia under the Latins and Epirotes—Fresh Bulgarian invasion of Macedonia—Macedonia under the Byzantines and Epirotes—Bulgars possess Macedonia once more for a brief period and then lose it for good in 1256

SAMUEL'S vast Macedonian Empire was not of long duration. Already under his immediate successors it began to decay, until finally in 1018 it fell completely under the domination of Byzantium. Of all the extensive territories that had formed the Macedonian Empire only the central Serbian tracts of Raška on the Drina, Lim and Tara, and Zeta on the coast remained free. These lands were destined to preserve the seed of the future liberation and unity of the Southern Slavs. The abortive insurrections in 1040 in the county of Vardar in Macedonia, which aimed at liberation from Byzantium, proved unsuccessful. While the Serbian States were laying up their strength for the great historic *rôle* of the Serbian nation in the Balkan Peninsula, Macedonia came yet again for a short time under Bulgarian rule.

From about A.D. 1000, when she fell under the domination of Byzantium, Bulgaria remained under it until 1186. In that year the Bulgars revolted against the Byzantine supremacy. With the help of the

Kumans (Russian *Polovci*) from the steppes of Pontus, they succeeded in freeing themselves and in once more establishing their State. The capital of this new Bulgarian State was Trnovo. As their power gradually increased the Bulgars awaited a suitable opportunity for embarking upon conquests. This opportunity arrived in 1202. In that year the Latins besieged Constantinople. While the siege was proceeding the Bulgarian Tsar Kalojan "took advantage of the general confusion and overran the western part of the Byzantine Empire from Sofia to the frontiers of Thessaly, taking the towns of Skoplje, Ochrida, and Ber, and even Prizren." [1] Not feeling secure in the territory they had conquered, the Bulgarians expelled all the Greek bishops and replaced them by Bulgarian ecclesiastics. They likewise transported all Greek suspects to the Danubian regions. Serbia was at the time powerless to prevent Bulgarian aggression and violence in Macedonia. The struggle for the throne, which was fomented by Hungary, absorbed all Serbia's strength and attention. This Bulgarian domination in Macedonia did not last long, only until the death of Kalojan in 1207. Then internal dissensions broke out among the Bulgarian princes, and Bulgaria was divided. Part of Macedonia came to be ruled by a relative of Kalojan, Strez by name, but under Serbian suzerainty. Strez died in 1215; part of his lands was taken by the Latins of Salonica, and part by the Greeks of Epirus. Thus every trace of Bulgarian rule in Macedonia was obliterated once more.

In 1223 Macedonia was ruled by Theodore Komnenus, Despot of Epirus, who presently proclaimed himself Emperor. His lieutenants—Greeks, Slavs, and Albanians

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 288.

—administered the provinces of Macedonia and Albania right up to the Serbian frontier, which ran north of Arban, Debar, and Skoplje.[1] Towards the east, Theodore Komnenus extended his power even over Thrace with its capital of Adrianople. Theodore ruled over Macedonia for seven years in all. In 1230 he was suddenly attacked, defeated, and made prisoner by the Bulgarian Tsar Asen II, near the village of Klokotnica (now Semisdze), on the road from Philippopolis to Adrianople. The Bulgars now without any difficulty occupied the country west of Adrianople, beyond Skoplje and Ochrida as far as Durazzo.[2] It is important to note that Tsar Asen says that by this victory he conquered *Serbian* lands. In gratitude for his success over Theodore Komnenus, Asen II built the Church of the Forty Martyrs in his capital of Trnovo. In an inscription in this church he gives a brief account of his war with Theodore. There he describes how he captured Theodore with all his nobles and subdued all the lands from Adrianople even to Durazzo: the *Greek*, then the *Albanian* and the *Serbian*.[3] This Bulgarian domination in Macedonia extended over a period of sixteen years in all.

In 1246, Michael, the son of Asen II, ascended the Bulgarian throne. That same year the Greek Emperor John Vatatzes succeeded in retaking from the Bulgars all the Macedonian provinces from Adrianople to the Vardar. Michael II, Despot of Epirus, on his part

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 300.

[2] Ibid., p. 303.

[3] The former translation of this passage from the inscription runs thus: "Und alle Länder habe ich erobert von Odrin (Adrianopel) bis nach Durazzo: das griechische, dann das albanische und serbische Land" (C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Bulgaren," pp. 148, 252).

occupied the Macedonian districts lying west of the Vardar, with the towns of Veles, Prilep, and Ochrida. In 1252 John Vatatzes overcame Michael II, and all Macedonia as far as the frontiers of the Serbian contemporary State became a Greek province.

There was one more Bulgarian invasion of Eastern Macedonia as far as the Vardar, which lasted from the end of 1254 until 1256, and was also "carried out without difficulty"; but I hardly know whether it is worth mentioning.[1]

Weak and insignificant as are these historic linkings of Macedonia with Bulgaria, such as they are they recur no more. From that time Bulgarian history has no further connection with Macedonia. Soon afterwards began the henceforth uninterrupted historic connection of Macedonia with Serbia. This connection has bequeathed to Macedonia imperishable and ineradicable memories. It has also brought the ethnic unity of the Macedonians and Serbs into better and clearer relief.

[1] It is interesting to note that the Bulgars never ran any risks for the sake of Macedonia, nor did they ever conquer it heroically and at the cost of great sacrifice. All their invasions of Macedonia occurred either at a time of "general confusion," or were accomplished "without any difficulty" (C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. pp. 288, 303, 315).

V

SERBIAN RULE IN MACEDONIA

Systematic unification of Serbian territory under the Nemanjići—Part of Macedonia won by King Uroš in 1258—Macedonia added to Serbia under King Milutin and King Stephan Dečanski—Bulgaria makes war upon Stephan Dečanski in 1330—Macedonia's fate permanently decided in favour of Serbia by the Serbian victory over the Bulgars—Subsequent insignificance of Bulgaria—Serbian magnanimity towards Bulgaria—King (afterwards Tsar) Dušan unites the whole of Macedonia with Serbia—Bulgars no longer interested in Macedonia—Bulgars conscious of having no claim on Macedonia—Bulgars recognize the legitimacy of the Serbian rule in Macedonia—Macedonia considered a Serbian country—Macedonians never called anything but "Serbs" in historic records—Dismemberment of the Serbian Empire—Macedonian States always referred to as "Serbian"—Turks conquer Macedonia as a Serbian country—This fact recognized by all historic sources, including Bulgarian—Serbian influence in Macedonia under the Turkish rule—Serbian princes in Macedonia under Turkish suzerainty—Serbian Sultana Marija and her importance for the Macedonian Serbs

WHILE Macedonia after losing her independence in 1018 was first under Byzantium and then for a short time under Bulgaria, two young and vigorous Serbian States grew up and developed to the north of her—Raška and Zeta. In the second half of the twelfth century they were united to form the one State of Serbia, which then entered upon the most brilliant epoch of the Serbian past. Slowly but surely, the native rulers of the new Serbian State emancipated the Serbian nation from

Byzantium and united the Serbian lands. The first Serbian ruler who set about to accomplish the systematic union of all the Serbian lands into one polity was the Grand Župan Stephan Nemanja (1169–1196). His successor went far beyond him. The complete union of the Serbian lands was especially apparent during the reigns of King Milutin (1282–1321) and Tsar Dušan (1331–1355). During these reigns Macedonia was also incorporated with Serbia.

We have already said that under Strez (1207–1215) Macedonia was for a short time under Serbian suzerainty. In 1258 King Uroš of Serbia took Skoplje, Prilep, and Kičevo from Byzantium, but lost them again shortly afterwards in 1261.[1] But this was only the prelude to the complete union of Macedonia with Serbia. In 1282, King Milutin, the son of Uroš, took Skoplje from Byzantium, together with the districts of Gornji and Donji Polog, in the upper Vardar valley, and subsequently Ovče Polje, Zletovo and Pijanac, round about the Bregalnica. No sooner had Milutin taken Skoplje than it became the capital and chief city of all Serbia. In 1283 King Milutin made further progress in liberating Serbian lands from Byzantium. He conquered the entire territory as far as Ser (the Seres of to-day), Morunac (Krestopolje, or Kavala of to-day), and the neighbourhood of Mount Athos, and afterwards added Poreć, Kičevo, and Debar in Macedonia to these conquests. Milutin's son Stephan Dečanski (1321–1331) took the town of Prosek on the lower Vardar.

During the whole of this Serbian progress in Macedonia, the Bulgars did not appear as Serbia's rivals nor did they attempt to hinder the Serbian advance in Macedonia.

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 317.

They waited, as before, for a convenient opportunity of success without difficulty. Such an opportunity was given them when trouble arose between Stephan Dečanski and the Emperor Andronikos III of Byzantium. Thinking that this was a propitious moment for an attack upon Stephan, the Bulgarian Tsar Mihajlo Šišman, who was married to Stephan's sister, put away his wife, married the sister of Andronikos in her stead, concluded an alliance with his new brother-in-law and attacked Stephan. Stephan begged Mihajlo to avoid war, but Mihajlo was obdurate. Trusting finally to defeat Stephan, Mihajlo, in the words of a contemporary, boasted that "he would set up his throne" in Serbia. Stephan was compelled to go to war. The Bulgars and the Byzantines advanced against him simultaneously, but their forces failed to establish a junction. Andronikos was late, and the Bulgars were defeated ere he could come to their rescue.

This war was of great importance, because it decided not only the question of the supremacy of Serbia over Bulgaria during the rest of the Middle Ages, but also the fate of Macedonia. The Serbs expected the Bulgars to attack from the east, but they turned southwards, towards Macedonia. Where the frontier between Serbia and Bulgaria follows the course of the river Struma, north-east of Velbužd (now called Ćustendil), the Bulgarian forces crossed the frontier into Serbia and went as far as Velbužd, "committing many evil deeds in that district."[1] The battle of Velbužd took place on July 28, 1330. The Bulgarian army was completely overthrown and Tsar Mihajlo himself slain in the battle. The Serbs were left victors and masters of the situation.

[1] St. Novaković, "Zakonik Stefana Dušana" ("Stephan Dušan's Code"), Belgrade, 1898, p. 8.

After the victory Stephan intended to subdue Bulgaria, but he was met on his way by the envoys of Belaur, brother of the fallen Tsar, and the Bulgarian nobles who tendered him their submission. How important was the Serbian victory and how great the Bulgarian defeat can be seen from the humble demeanour of the Bulgarian envoys towards the Serbian King. "This Empire of Bulgaria"—thus the Bulgarian envoys addressed King Stephan—"and the whole of its state, its towns and their wealth and their glory, let them be to-day in your hand to dispose of all this as though it were given to you by God. We, your slaves, hail you as our overlord and mighty King. . . . Henceforth let the Kingdom of Serbia and the Empire of Bulgaria be as one, and let there be peace." These words were recorded by the Serbian Archbishop Danilo, who was a contemporary of these events.[1] Thus was solved the problem of the relations between Serbs and Bulgars in the Middle Ages. Thus was the fate of Macedonia decided at that time.

King Stephan showed himself magnanimous towards the Bulgars. Directly after the battle he caused the body of the Bulgarian Tsar to be interred in the Monastery of Nagoričino, near Kumanovo, "in our country," as his son Tsar Dušan used to say in after-years.[2] He did not interfere with the Bulgarian polity, which was reduced to the frontiers of the Bulgarian people. He confirmed the Bulgarian nobles in their former privileges, and on the Bulgarian throne he placed his banished sister, Tsar

[1] Dj. Daničić, "Životi Kraljeva i arhiepiskopa srpskih" ("Lives of the Serbian Kings and Archbishops"), by Archbishop Danilo, Zagreb, 1866, pp. 193–195.

[2] St. Novaković, "Zakonik Stefana Dušana" ("Stephan Dušan's Code"), p. 3.

Mihajlo's widow, with her son Jovan Stephan, who was not yet of age. On the spot where he had invoked the help of God before the battle the pious Serbian King erected a church to Our Blessed Saviour, which, although in ruins to-day, still shows clear traces of its original beauty. To this victory the King also dedicated the Monastery of Dečani, which was then being built, the finest example of Serbian ecclesiastical architecture in the Middle Ages. Stephan's son Dušan, who soon afterwards succeeded to the Serbian throne, continued his father's policy towards the Bulgars, and concluded an alliance with them which lasted until the fall of the mediæval Empires of both Serbia and Bulgaria.

Dušan's reign marks an epoch in the history of Macedonia, one more brilliant and prosperous than any she had hitherto passed through. At the very outset of his reign he took Ochrid, Strumica, Kostur, and many other towns in Macedonia from Byzantium, right up to Salonica. In Salonica there was already a considerable party prepared to open the gates and surrender the city to him; but the Byzantine Emperor Andronikos III arrived with a large army and prevented the Serbs from entering Salonica. Later on, in 1342, Dušan took Voden and Melnik; in 1345 he took Ser (Seres), Drama, Philippi, Hristopolje (now called Orfano). Thus the whole of Macedonia became a Serbian province. The eastern frontiers of Dušan's empire extended from the crest of Mount Rilo along the slopes of the Dospat and the left basin of the River Mesta down to the sea.[1]

[1] St. Novaković, "Strumska Oblast u XIV veku"—"The Province of Struma in the Fourteenth Century" ("Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxxiv). By the same author: "Srbi i Turci u Srednjem Veku" ("Serbs and Turks in the Middle Ages"), p. 129.

During the whole time of Dušan's progress in Macedonia, the Bulgars showed no dissatisfaction. After the battle of Velbužd, Bulgaria was to a certain extent dependent upon Serbia.[1] Dušan was constantly at war, first with Byzantium and then with Hungary. Had the Bulgars been conscious of a right to Macedonia, these would have been suitable opportunities for allying themselves to either of these two Powers, and not only to rise in defence of Macedonia, but also to emancipate themselves from the Serbian supremacy. In the meantime they did neither, but remained on the best of terms with Dušan, even at a time when the throne of Bulgaria was not occupied by Dušan's kinsman. But what is most important with reference to Macedonia is that the Bulgars took it for granted that by the Serbian conquest of Macedonia their rights were in no way encroached upon, and that they plainly recognized Serbia's right to that country. When in 1346 the Archbishop of Serbia was precisely in Macedonia raised to the rank of "Patriarch of the Serbs and Greeks"—the expression used at that time to define the Serbian Empire—the Bulgars would certainly have protested had they looked upon the Macedonian population as Bulgarian. As a matter of fact they did nothing of the kind, but the promotion of the Archbishop of Serbia to the Patriarchate was carried out "with the full approval of the Bulgarian Patriarch of Trnovo."[2] When subsequently on Easter

[1] On October 15, 1345, Dušan, King of Serbia, addressed a letter to Andrea Dandolo, Doge of Venice, beginning as follows: "Stephanus, Dei gratia Serviæ, Diocliæ, Chilminiæ, Zentæ, Albaniæ et Maritimæ regionis rex, nec non *Bulgariæ imperii* partis non modice *particeps* et fere totius Romaniæ Dominus" ("Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," xi. pp. 262–263).

[2] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 387.

Sunday of the same year the Serbian King solemnized his second coronation as Serbian Tsar, likewise in Macedonia, there was even greater opportunity for a Bulgarian protest. Byzantium protested. She declared the establishment of the Serbian Patriarchate uncanonical and the coronation of the Serbian Tsar non-valid. The Greek Patriarch Kallistos anathematized the new "uncanonical" Patriarch and the "unlawful" Tsar. The Greeks would not hear of a Serbian Empire which was proclaimed on territory which they had once owned and to which they still claimed to have rights. The Emperor John Kantakuzenos, in his "History," never once refers to Dušan as "Tsar," always as "King." And thus we find it also in other Byzantine sources. The Bulgars, however, did not consider that the Serbian Patriarch and Tsar had usurped their rank, and they took no steps against them; but Dušan's coronation as Tsar was solemnized in Macedonia on the strength of the conquest of Macedonia, and moreover "with the blessing and consent (lit. *hands*) of the Bulgarian Patriarch and the consent (hands) of all the Bishops of the Bulgarian Synod."[1] By the conquest of Macedonia, Serbia became great. By this conquest she became worthy of proclaiming herself an Empire. The Bulgars not only acquiesced in this without taking offence, but they even added their blessing.

Bulgaria did this consciously. Macedonia was looked upon as Serbian territory. Ever since the earliest times after the Slav immigration into the Balkan Peninsula Serbs have been mentioned as inhabiting Macedonia.

[1] St. Novaković, "Zakonik Stefana Dušana" ("Stephan Dušan's Code"), p. 4. C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 387.

The Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus[1] wrote some time about 950 that the town of "τὰ Σερβλία," in the district of Salonica near the River Bistrieca, at the foot of Olympus, derives its name from the Serbs who originally settled there. Subsequently this town is frequently mentioned. It was also the seat of the Bishop; in an old Serbo-Slav translation of the Greek writer Johannes Zonaras it is called Srpčište.[2] The small number of Bulgarian conquerors had disappeared completely and left no trace. Writing in the middle of the fourteenth century, the Greek historian Nicephorus Gregoræ says that the Byzantine Emperor Basil II destroyed the Bulgars, at that time masters of Macedonia, in many battles, and that "he banished those who remained in the land (Macedonia) to Moesija on the Danube."[3] As we have seen, the Bulgarian Tsar Asen, after conquering Macedonia in 1230, expressly states in an inscription in the church of the Forty Martyrs in Trnovo that he had conquered "the Greek, the Albanian, and the *Serbian* lands." This was a hundred years before the Serbian conquest of Macedonia. The Serbs conquered Macedonia as a Serbian country.

Neither in connection with the conquest of Macedonia nor later are the Bulgars mentioned among the inhabitants. King Milutin several times mentions his conquests in Macedonia. He mentions the conquered counties, and refers to them by their local names or by the names of their towns; but nowhere do we find a word about Bulgars. In Milutin's biography, which

[1] Const. Porphyrogenitus, "De administrando Imperio," chap. xxii. p. 152, ed. Bonn.

[2] "Starine Jugoslovenske Akademije," Zagreb, vol. xiv. p. 163.

[3] N. Gregoræ, "Histor. Bizant.," ii. 2, p. 15*a*, ed. Bonn.

was compiled by his contemporary, the Archbishop Danilo, all Milutin's Macedonian conquests are likewise enumerated; the counties are mentioned, and again there is no mention of Bulgars. Writing about the year 1318, the Serbian Archbishop Nikodim chronicles all the deeds of the Serbian King Milutin "in his own native country, in the Serbian land." Afterwards he speaks of the Serbian Council, in which the bishops and monks were also included. Among the Serbian bishops is mentioned the Bishop of Skoplje, and among the *Serbian* monks are mentioned the monks of Tetovo, Gostivar, Nagoričino, and Skoplje.[1] A MS. of the Monastery of Lesnovo, in Macedonia, dating from 1330, says of Milutin's successor Stephan Dečanski that "he inherited the kingdom, i.e. all the *Serbian* maritime regions, those by the Danube and the Ovče Polje."[2] Relating the history of the Bulgarian attack upon the Serbs in 1330, Stephan Dečanski, in a deed to the Monastery of Dečani, says that the Bulgarian Tsar went to Macedonia in order to conquer "Serbian territory." In the Appendix to his Code, Tsar Dušan says that the Bulgarian Tsar went against "Our country, against the land of our fathers."[3]

Under Dušan's reign the Serbs conquered the whole of Macedonia. In a deed to the Monastery of Treskavac, near Prilep, in 1336, in which he is styled "Stephan, King of all Serbian and the Maritime Regions," Dušan says that "with the help of God Almighty, the Preserver and His immaculate Mother, and the prayers of his forbears Simeon and Sava, he had taken many towns over which

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski zapisi i natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 301–304.

[2] "Glasnik Srpsrog Učenog Društva," vol. xvi. pp. 34–35.

[3] St. Novaković, "Zakonik Stefana Dušana" ("Stephan Dušan's Code"), p. 8.

the Greeks had formerly ruled."[1] But not a word about the Bulgars. In a note in a MS. of the Four Gospels written at Mount Athos, about 1347, we are told that "by God's grace and the prayers of his ancestors, it was given to Dušan to rule over the whole of the *Serbian* land, as far as the town of Morunac, which is called Kristopolje (the Kavala of to-day), and as far as Salonica, and over all Dioclitia as far as Drač."[2] In a deed presented by Tsar Dušan about 1350 to his Monastery of the Blessed Archangels St. Michael and St. Gabriel at Prizren, the gifts he bestowed upon this monastery are enumerated. Among other gifts, he also endowed it with a church in Veles with "men, mills, and vineyards," and with a church in Strumica with "men, lands, vineyards, and mills." In assessing the rights and duties of these men whom he assigned to the monastery, he refers to them as *Serbs*, Albanians, and Vallachians. No Bulgars are mentioned.[3] In the Code which he compiled for the whole of his empire at the State Councils of Skoplje in 1349 and of Seres in 1354, Dušan nowhere mentions Bulgars, although he omitted none of the nationalities represented in his country, viz. Serbs, Greeks, Albanians, and Germans.[4] It is impossible that the Serbian legislators of that time, at two Councils, both held in Macedonia, should have remained ignorant of the existence of a Bulgarian element—if it existed—in Macedonia. If even the small national populations in

[1] St. Novaković, "Balkanska Pitanja" ("The Balkan Question"), pp. 290–293.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 89.

[3] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xv. pp. 264–310.

[4] St. Novaković, "Zakonik Stefana Dušana" ("Stephan Dušan's Code"), Arts. 32, 39, 77, 82, 178.

Serbia are mentioned in the Code, as in the case of the small German mining population, the Bulgars would certainly not have been omitted. In the decree issued by Dušan at the Council of Skoplje in 1347, whereby he made the Monastery of Lesnovo, in Macedonia, the seat of the bishopric, he is styled "Stephan, the God-fearing Tsar in Christ our Lord and autocrat of the Serbs and Greeks and the whole of the Western Regions."[1] This decree concerns some of the most important institutions in Macedonia. It was approved by the first Serbian Council convoked after the proclamation of the Serbian Empire, and it deals not only with the establishment of the bishopric, but also with many other matters, such as the duties of the subject. Here, also, there is not a word about Bulgars. Dušan's usual signature as Tsar ran: "Tsar of the Serbs and Greeks," and when signing in Latin he styled himself, "Imperator Rasciæ et Romaniæ."[2] Neither of his titles makes mention of Bulgars.

Nor are Bulgars mentioned in books written in Macedonia during the Serbian rule; nor are they mentioned in any notes in these books. On the contrary, it is recorded in these books merely that they were written at such and such a place, in such and such a country, during the reign of such and such a Serbian sovereign. The Serbian sovereigns are praised in these books; the monasteries they built in Macedonia, the gifts they bestowed upon these monasteries, their successes are extolled and their victories commemorated. Some of these books commemorate the Serbian victories over the Bulgars.[3]

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxvii. pp. 288, etc.

[2] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija po Evropčiskoj Turciji," pp. 49-50. C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 386.

[3] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 34, 48, 56, 75, 103, 4944.

Even in those Serbian records which have their origin in Macedonia there is no mention made of Bulgars anywhere. On the contrary, it clearly transpires from these books that the population of Macedonia was Serbian.

Foreign records in this respect absolutely corroborate the Serbian. C. Jireček says that according to the Greek historian N. Gregoras, who lived during Dušan's reign, there were at the time of Dušan's conquests in South Macedonia "Greek and Serbian parties in every town." [1] N. Gregoræ relates how the Byzantine Empress Irene sent her kinsman Manuel Tarhaniot to seek the fugitive Kantakuzen, and how starting from Dimotik he crossed the Balkan mountains (the Hæmus) and entered the Serbian land.[2] John Kantakuzenos, who waged long wars on Macedonian territory against John, the lawful Emperor of Byzantium, against the Empress Anna and the Serbian Tsar Dušan, had every opportunity of becoming well acquainted with Macedonia and of thoroughly exploring it. There are frequent references to Serbs in Macedonia in his "History." [3]

Even after Dušan's reign there is no mention of

[1] C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 382.

[2] "Relicto igitur ob metum recto tramite, sinistrum versus per ovia contendere arduisque ac difficultibus locis applicare se perrexit, donec Hæmo monte superato, in *Tribalorum terram*, illæsus furtim delapsus est" (Nicephori Gregoræ, "Hist. Bizant.," xiii. 4, 8, p. 623, ed. Bonn).

[3] He mentions them as living near Prosek (Prosæcum, a town on the Vardar at the eastern opening of the Demir Kapija gorge; now in ruins): "Interea pecuarius quidam *Tribalus*, iuxtra Prosacum in vico Davidis nuncupato habitans Zimpanus (Živan, a typical Serbian name), nomine auditis quæ Cantacuseno . . ." (Joannis Cantacuseni Imperatoris Historiarum, iii. 394, vol. ii. p. 256); near Philippi (between Seres, Drama and Kavala, now in ruins): "Pauci enim *Tribali* ex proximis vicis concurrentes . . ." (Ibid., iv. 45, vol. ii. 329).

Bulgars in Macedonia. Dušan was succeeded on the throne of Serbia by his son Tsar Uros (1355–1371). His official title was "Stephan Uroš, Tsar of the Serbs and Greeks." [1] In a document dating from 1365 the sons of Branko Mladenović, Serbian Governor of the county of Ochrid, call Tsar Uroš "Autocrat of all Serbian, Greek, and the Maritime Regions." [2]

Under the feeble reign of Tsar Uroš, the division and dismemberment of the Serbian Empire soon set in. Macedonia, too, was divided into several parts, the men who had acted as governors under Dušan setting themselves up as independent princes in the districts over which they ruled. This was an excellent opportunity for showing to whom Macedonia truly belonged. The new Macedonian sovereigns, who had broken away from the Serbian Empire, were no longer in any way bound to it. They were independent and could style themselves as they pleased. Had their Macedonian subjects been Bulgars, there would have been no reason why they should not have proclaimed themselves Bulgarian sovereigns. Hereby they would not only have increased the loyalty of their subjects, but they would have eliminated from Macedonia even the shadow of the Serbian domination. But we find no trace of this. All parts of Macedonia continued to remain Serbian, and their sovereigns continued to style themselves *Serbian* princes.

In Dušan's reign his half-brother (on his mother's side) Simeun (Siniša) was Governor in Epirus and part of Macedonia. During Uroš's reign, Simeun in 1356

[1] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija," p. 51. C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. p. 414.

[2] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. iii. p. 81.

gathered an army composed of "*Serbs*, Greeks, and Albanians," and proclaimed himself independent "Tsar of the Greeks, Serbs and all Albania."[1] In 1361 he signed his name thus: "Simeun Palæologos, god-fearing Tsar in Christ the Lord and Autocrat of the Greeks and Serbs. . . ."[2] On another occasion he styled himself "Simeun Uroš Palæologos, god-fearing Tsar in Christ the Lord and Autocrat of the Greeks and Serbs and all Albania."[3]

In Dušan's reign Vukašin Mrnjavić was Župan in Prilep. At the beginning of his reign Uroš created him a Despot, but Vukašin was not satisfied with this. In 1366 he proclaimed himself an independent King and ruled over the territory on either side of the Šar Mountain with the chief towns of Prizren, Skoplje, Prilep and Bitolj. In all these regions he was acknowledged by the inhabitants as King. He officially styled himself "Lord of the Serbian land, of the Greeks, and the Western Regions."[4] In a letter to the Republic of Ragusa on April 5, 1370, King Vukašin says of himself, "and He (Christ) appointed me lord of all the *land of Serbia*, of the Greeks and Western Regions."[5]

Vukašin's brother Uglješa proclaimed himself independent ruler of the neighbouring Macedonian counties towards the east. In Serbian and Greek records he is spoken of as "Despot of Serbia."[6] Both Vukašin and

[1] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. p. 415.

[2] Fr. Miklosich and Jos. Müller, "Acta et diplomata Græca medii ævi," iii. p. 129.

[3] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xviii. p. 201.

[4] St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci" ("Serbs and Turks"), p. 144. C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. pp. 423, 430, 433.

[5] Fr. Miklosich, "Monumenta Serbica," p. 180.

[6] Fr. Miklosich et Jos. Müller, "Acta et diplomata græca medii ævi," i. pp. 553, 558, 559, 571. St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci" ("Serbs and Turks"), pp. 153, 155, 166. C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. p. 431.

Uglješa are referred to as "Serbian lords" also in a contemporary Bulgarian chronicle (1296–1413). This chronicle was penned in Bulgaria, in the Bulgarian tongue, and from an altogether Bulgarian point of view.[1] The author knew what he was writing about, and his testimony is perfectly reliable.

In the north-east of Macedonia, after having renounced their allegiance to him, two cousins of Uroš, the brothers Despot Jovan Dragas and Konstantin Dejanović ruled independently in the territory around Ištip, Strumica, Kumanovo, Kratovo, and Velbužd. It was after this Konstantin that Velbužd was renamed Ćustendil. Konstantin's daughter Helen speaks of him in 1395 as "the most pious and the most illustrious of the Serbian lords."[2] In 1401 an envoy arrived in Venice from "Konstantin (Dejanović), lord of Serbia, of that territory which surrounds our own territory of Durazzo" ("Constantini domini Serviæ, territorii, quod est circa territorium nostrum Durachii").[3]

Besides the aforesaid princes there were also in Uroš's time several lesser territorial lords in Macedonia, such as Srbin Novak, the "Kesar" (treasurer) around Lake Prespa, Branko Mladenović of Ochrid, and Bogdan, lord of the territory between Salonica and Seres.[4] Of

[1] J. Bogdan, "Ein Beitrag zur bulgarischen und serbischen Geschichtschreibung" ("Archiv für slavische Philologie," iii. 1891, p. 527). The Chronicle is "ohne Zweifel in Bulgarien und von einem Bulgaren geschrieben wurden, ausserdem ist sie in mittel-bulgarischer Recension erhalten" (p. 490). "Die Chronic ist ganz vom Standpunkte eines Bulgaren geschrieben" (p. 492).

[2] Fr. Miklosich et Jos. Müller, "Acta et diplomata Græca medii ævi," ii. pp. 260, 261. St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci" ("Serbs and Turks"), p. 190.

[3] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. iii. p. 198.

[4] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. pp. 415, 434.

none of these is it anywhere said that they were in any way akin to Bulgars.

The Turks conquered Macedonia as a Serbian country. Contemporaneously with the breaking-up of the Serbian Empire after Dušan's death came the spreading of the Turks in Europe. Already during Dušan's lifetime the Turks took Gallipoli from the Greeks (1354) and thence began to attack both Byzantine and Serbian territory. During the feeble reign of Tsar Uroš they had already overrun a considerable part. In 1365 Adrianople was already the Turkish capital, and the whole territory from the Sea of Marmora to the Balkan Mountains and from the Black Sea to the Rhodope Mountains was in the hands of the Turks. The focus of the Turkish power was consequently transferred from Asia to Europe. In face of the Turkish peril the Serbian princes were compelled to think of serious measures to defend themselves and their lands. During the summer of 1371 Uglješa Mrnjavič made preparations to expel the Turks from Thrace. He was joined by his brother Vukašin. The advance against the Turks began in the autumn of that year. On September 26th a decisive encounter took place between the Serbs and Turks on the left bank of the River Marica, to the east of the Mustafa-Pasha Palanka of to-day, north of Černomen (now called Čirmen). The Serbs were defeated and Uglješa and Vukašin perished on the field. After this battle the Turks conquered Macedonia.

Serbian and foreign historical sources agree in stating that it was the *Serbian* army which was defeated on the Marica, that *Serbian* princes perished, and that, after the battle, *Serbian* lands were conquered.

Serbian historical sources look upon the disaster on

the Marica as an event of the Serbian past, and they include it in the category of Serbian historic events.[1] A contemporary of the battle on the Marica, the Serbian Monk Jsajija who lived in Seres, not far from the spot where the bloody encounter took place between the Serbs and Turks, relates "how the Despot Uglješa raised all *Serbian* and Greek fighting men and his brother King Vukašin and many other chiefs, to expel the Turks."[2] Vladislav Gramatik, a Serbian writer of the second half of the fifteenth century, says that "the *Serbian* army of Macedonia was beaten to its knees by the river which is called the Marica."[3] The Serbian Patriarch Pajsej, writing in the first half of the seventeenth century, says that the Turks after taking Adrianople "tried to enter *Serbian* territory," and that they were opposed by Uglješa and Vukašin with the *Serbian* forces.[4]

The historical sources of Western Europe absolutely agree with the Serbian records as regards the battle on the Marica. The news of the Serbian disaster did not reach Pope Gregory XI at Avignon until the spring of 1372. Writing in May of that year to King Louis of Hungary, to inform him of the situation in the Balkan Peninsula after the battle on the Marica, the Pope says that in that battle several magnates of the Kingdom of *Serbia* were defeated ("subactis quibusdam magnatibus regnii Rasciæ"). That same year in the autumn the Archbishop of Neopatra, in the duchy of

[1] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. iii. pp. 95, 126, 131, 139, 149, 151, 154.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 4944.

[3] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. p. 287.

[4] "Ibid., p. 222.

Athens, wrote to the Pope telling him that "the Turks had gained a brilliant victory over sundry magnates of Greece, Vallachia (Thessaly), and the Kingdom of *Serbia*," and that after subduing these lands the Turks had advanced up to the frontiers of the duchy of Athens and the principality of Achaia.[1]

The records of the nearest neighbours of the Serbians, the Roumanians, likewise speak of the disaster on the Marica as of a Serbian defeat. In a Roumanian MS. dating from the beginning of the seventeenth century, we are told that in 1371 "Murat with the Turks attacked Uglješa and Vukašin. They gathered together a great *Serbian* army and accepted battle with the Turks . . . the Turks were finally victorious, and Uglješa and Vukašin were slain in the valley of the Marica in 1371."[2]

And also the Turks, the opponents of the Serbs in the battle of the Marica, and therefore intimately connected with these events, wrote similarly. Their annals, which Zinkeisen drew upon in compiling his Turkish History, say that "the *Serbian* infidels had gathered together to attack Adrianople," but that they were routed.[3]

Finally, the Bulgarian historical sources agree with the rest. The contemporary Bulgarian chronicle already referred to (1296–1413) relates how Vukašin and Uglješa "gathered a great Serbian army and went up against the town of Serez, how the Turks sallied forth to oppose them, how there was a great battle and

[1] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," vol. i. p. 440.

[2] V. Grigorovič, "O Serbiji v ea otnošeniah k sosednim deržavam," Kazan, 1859, p. 17.

[3] J. W. Zinkeisen, "Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches," Hamburg, 1840, i. p. 224.

bloodshed on the Marica, and how the Turks slew Uglješa and Vukašin while the Serbs were in flight."[1]

The Turkish historical sources, from which Zinkeisen takes his description of the battle on the Marica, viz. those of Nešri, Irdis-Bitlisi, Sead-Edin, and the Turkish chronicler of Leunklav only have traditional knowledge of this battle, and were compiled a hundred years after the battle had taken place. According to them the site of the battle was called at that time *Sirb* Zandughi, which signifies the *Serbian* peril. The place was always referred to by that name. It is to this day called *Srb*-Sindigi (Serbian downfall), *Srb* Sidi (the Serbian feared), or *Srb* Hududi (Serbian frontier).[2] As there were no Serbs engaged in the battle on the Marica save those from Macedonia, this *Serbian peril* can only refer to the Serbs of Macedonia.

The battle on the Marica did not yet put an end to the Serbian rule in Macedonia. King Vukašin who perished on the Marica was succeeded by his son, King Marko (1371–1394), and his brothers Dmitar and Andrija. While acknowledging the suzerainty of the Turkish Sultan, Marko remained until his death the Serbian King of Macedonia with his capital in Prilep. Likewise as a Turkish vassal Jovan Dragaš Dejanović ruled, for some time jointly with his brother Konstantin and afterwards as sole ruler, over the territory around

[1] J. Bogdan, "Archiv für slavische Philologie," xiii. p. 528.

[2] See the following references for the foregoing: J. W. Zinkeisen, "Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches," i. 225; N. Jorga, "Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches," i. 1908, Gotha, p. 241; Le Vte de la Jonquière, "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman," i. Paris, 1914, p. 70; St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci," pp. 176–177; J. Mišković, "Jedan Priloščić Maričkom Boju"—"A Contribution to the Battle on the Marica" ("Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije"), vol. lviii. p. 111).

Ištip, Strumica, Kumanovo, Kratovo and Velbužd. Finally, south of that, in the district between Salonica, Seres, and Lake Dojran, lay Bogdan's state. These Serbian princes paid tribute to the Sultan and had to furnish him with auxiliary contingents when he went to war, but in all other respects they were quite independent. They carried on the traditions of the Serbian kings in their territories; they built and restored churches and monasteries, endowed them handsomely and protected the Serbian people. King Marko (Kraljević Marko) is to this day the most popular hero of the national ballad poetry in all Serbian lands. Fighting as Turkish vassals both King Marko and Jovan Dragaš perished in the Battle of Rovine in 1394 against the Roumanian Duke Mirče. After their death the Turks definitely subjugated their lands. The last Serbian ruler in Macedonia was Bogdan, who can be traced up to the year 1413.

But the Serbian influence in Macedonia did not end then. It extended far into the dark days of the Turkish domination in Macedonia. The influence of Serbian ruling and noble families persisted for a long time in Macedonia, and disappeared only with the death in 1487 of the Sultana Marija, the daughter of the Serbian Despot Djuradj Branković. This princess was married to the Sultan Murat II. When she became a widow in 1451 she at first returned to what was left of free Serbia in those days; but in 1457 she quitted Serbia and took up her residence in Macedonia at Ježevo near Seres, where she lived until her death. Her life and work may be looked upon as a continuation of the Serbian rule and Serbian influence in Macedonia. Although the spouse of a Turkish sultan,

she supported the Christian Churches, priests and monks, and bestowed her charity upon the world of the Christians. In her widowhood, highly respected and generously treated by the Sultan Mehmed II, she enjoyed an ample and quasi-royal maintenance in Macedonia. But what matters in this connection is that she occupied the position of a kind of Serbian sovereign in Macedonia. In her letters she writes like a reigning Tsaritsa, assuming the royal titles of the Serbian kings in the days of their independence, "Carica i samodržica Kira Marija" (Empress and Autocrat Lady Mary). She insists even more distinctly on her Serbian nationality when in her letters she clearly indicates her connection with her Serbian kin ("Sultana Cara Murata, Carica Mara, kći Djurdja Despota"—Tsaritsa Mara, spouse of the Sultan Tsar Murat and daughter of the Despot Djuradj). On her letters she always employed her father's seal with the inscription "Gospodin Despot Djuradj" (Lord Despot Djuradj).

The Sultana Marija went even further. She worked in the spirit of the Serbian kings of old. She, like them, endowed churches and monasteries, and protected them. She not only compelled the Turks to fulfil their obligations towards the Serbian people, but, like a real sovereign, entered into relations with other States besides Turkey. The Ragusan archives contain many letters from her addressed to the Republic of Ragusa. In these letters she arranged that the tribute which the Ragusans were compelled to pay to the Serbian Church in Jerusalem at the time of the Serbian kings should henceforth be given to the Serbian Monasteries of Hilendar and St. Paul at the Mount of Athos, "which were built by our ancestors St. Simeon

Nemanja, the Archbishop St. Sava, and others who have succeeded them unto this day." In her letters she refers to the Serbian laws, "which were compiled by my imperial forbears, Tsar Dušan and Tsar Uroš."

The Serbian kings had always paid special respect to the memory of those godly men who first preached the Gospel to the Balkan Slavs. There were many such missionaries in Macedonia during the tenth century. Because of their godly work they were canonized and popular legends about them grew up among the people. After conquering Macedonia the Serbian kings and nobles abundantly honoured the memory of these preachers of Christianity by erecting monasteries over their graves or in places connected with their work. Thus were founded in Macedonia the monasteries of Sarandapor and Nagoričino, which were built by King Milutin and dedicated to St. Jovan Sarandaporski, the Monastery of the Blessed Archangel in Lesnovo, which was built in honour of St. Gabriel Lesnovski by the Serbian Despot Oliver, and the Monastery of Rilo which was built by the noble Hrelja in honour of St. John Rilski. The Sultana Marija followed in the footsteps of the Serbian kings with regard to these saints. She restored the Monastery of Rilo. The body of St. John of Rilo, which had been worshipped as a holy relic in the Rilo Mountain near this monastery had since then been moved from one place to another until it reached the Bulgarian capital of Trnovo. Not wishing it to remain in a foreign land, the monks of Rilo begged that the remains of St. John Rilski might be transferred to the Monastery of Rilo. Thanks to the efforts of the Sultana Marija the wish of the Serbian

monks was fulfilled with great pomp and amid a great concourse of Serbs from Macedonia. Thus the Serbian people of Macedonia realized the presence of a Serbian Empress among them even in the midst of the Turkish rule.

Before the end of her life the Sultana Marija brought her sister Kantakuzina to live with her, and both together protected the Serbian people and the Christian faith in Macedonia. The Sultana died on September 14, 1487, and was laid to rest in the Monastery of Kosanica near Seres. Her sister was buried at Konča, above Strumica.

Because of her devotion to the Christian faith and to the Serbian people an abundant tradition of the Sultana Marija has survived. A strip of the coast between Salonica and the Peninsula of Kasandra has been named *Kalamarija* after her—Mary the Good.

Only with the death in 1487 of the Sultana Marija did the influence of the tradition of Serbian rule in Macedonia finally come to an end.

VI

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN RULES IN MACEDONIA

Comparative duration of Bulgarian and Serbian rules in Macedonia—Bulgars and conquered Slavs in Macedonia two nations—Bulgars are masters, and Macedonians slaves—Reasons why they never mingled—No traces left of Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, either ethnically or as regards civilization—Misconceptions concerning Bulgaria's *rôle* in the creation of Slav letters and literature—The Macedonians pioneers of Christianity among the Slavs—The first Slav apostles natives of Macedonia—Bulgars also receive Christianity from Macedonia—Language of earliest Slav books merely called "Slav"—Second Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, short, tyrannical, and obnoxious

Serbs and Macedonians are but one nation—Serbian rulers the liberators and unifiers of the Serbian nation into one state entity—Serbian rule in Macedonia represents the zenith of Serbian civilization—Building of monasteries and intellectual progress in Macedonia—Serbian literature in Macedonia—Dušan's Code originated in Macedonia—Macedonia the heart and focus of the Serbian Empire—Serbian capitals situated in Macedonia—State Councils, at which the fate of the nation was decided, held in Macedonia—It was in Macedonia that Serbia was elevated to the rank of an Empire and the Serbian Church to that of a Patriarchate—Byzantine influence reaches Serbia through Macedonia

BULGARIAN rule in Macedonia lasted, as we have seen, from A.D. 861 to A.D. 969, from A.D. 1202 to A.D. 1204, and from A.D. 1230 to A.D. 1246, one hundred and twenty-nine years in all. The Serbian rule, not counting the reign of the Sultana Marija, lasted from

A.D. 1282 to A.D. 1413, or one hundred and thirty-one years in all. As regards length, there is practically nothing to choose between the Bulgarian rule and the Serbian in Macedonia, except, perhaps, in so far as the Bulgarian rule was interrupted, whereas the Serbian was continuous. There is, nevertheless, a great and real difference between the Bulgarian rule and the Serbian in Macedonia.

The Bulgars and the conquered Macedonians were two different nations as regards origin, race, and civilization. Special conditions were required to bring about their fusion into one nation. Such fusion, however, was out of the question. The Bulgarian conquerors in Macedonia represented an infinitesimal layer, which kept itself aloof from the nation at large and refrained from intermingling with it. When the Bulgars took Macedonia for the first time from Byzantium they established their garrisons in the cities and thence ruled the nation at large as the Greeks had previously done. Under these conditions the Macedonian populace, which was mostly rural, merely exchanged one master for another. The Macedonian clans continued to live under their tribal chieftains under the Bulgarian rule as they had formerly done under the Greek, only instead of paying tribute to the Greeks they now paid it to the Bulgars. Reliable Byzantine sources actually mention that such relations did subsist between the Macedonians and the Bulgars.[1] Between the Bulgarian masters and the conquered Macedonians there was no intermingling. And in Macedonia the Bulgars represented only a superficial layer which never penetrated the depths of the nation at large. In Macedonia the Bulgarian rule was the same as later on

[1] J. Cameniata, ed. Bonn, 496, p. 6.

the Turkish, which in more than five hundred years failed to produce ethnical changes in the indigenous population. The Bulgars, too, exercised no ethnical influence on the body of the people; it remained entirely unchanged.

The first period of Bulgarian rule in Macedonia falls into the time when the Bulgars were still barbarians. The population of Macedonia was then, as far as civilization is concerned, far ahead of its conquerors. For this reason it was impossible for the Bulgars to leave traces of a Bulgarian civilization in Macedonia.

To the Macedonian Slavs falls the honour that, towards the middle of the ninth century, the first *Slav* Christian books and MSS. were written in their dialect. From this has arisen a misapprehension, as though the earliest Slav writings had been written in the Bulgarian tongue and as though the Bulgars were responsible for this achievement. The very stage at which Bulgarian civilization was at that time gives the lie to such an assumption. Positive facts which we will go into definitely exclude any theory in favour of the Bulgars.

Immediately after the immigration of the Slavs into the Balkan Peninsula, Christianity began gradually to spread among them. Assisted by the imperial officials, Greek and Roman missionaries induced the pagan Slavs to accept Christianity. Among the less-frequented, isolated mountain tribes matters did not always go smoothly, but in the more accessible parts of the country, where there were cities, as in Macedonia and Thessaly, they progressed far more satisfactorily. At a very early date new bishoprics were created whence Christianity was propagated among the Slavs. Presently

Slavs were even ordained to the priesthood. It is true that divine service continued to be celebrated in Greek, but the priests had to preach and to impart instruction to the people in the Slav tongue. By adapting the words of their native tongue to Christian ideas these Slav priests laid the first foundations of Slav Christianity. Thus the definite conversion of the Slavs to the Christian faith was largely prepared in Macedonia. Macedonia is the cradle of Slav Christianity. But all this movement towards converting the Slavs is in no way connected with the Bulgars. It took place generations before any Bulgar set foot in Macedonia.

This first, partial conversion of the Macedonian Slavs was only the prelude of their final and complete adoption of Christianity. This, too, was quite unconnected with the Bulgars. It was fully prepared before the Bulgars ever conquered Macedonia. The brothers Cyril and Method, natives of Salonica, were the true apostles of Christianity among the Slavs. Being highly accomplished, they were also well acquainted with the Macedonian dialect. Method was for many years Greek Governor of a Slav province in Macedonia, before the beginning of the Bulgarian conquest.

In 862 the Moravian princes, Rastislav and Svetopluk, sent envoys to the Byzantine Emperor Michael III, asking for missionaries acquainted with the Slav tongue and the Christian faith, who would introduce Christianity in the Slav language in Moravia. For this task Cyril and Method were chosen; they invented the Slav alphabet, translated the most needful of the Holy Scriptures and liturgic writings into the language of the Macedonians, and undertook the charge entrusted to them in Moravia. The mission of the Moravian princes falls into the year

862, and the Bulgars began their conquest of Macedonia in 861. Long before that date Cyril and Method were in Constantinople. The Slav language they knew was the Macedonian. Their labours in translating the Holy Scriptures are outside any connection with the Bulgars. In all records, both contemporary and subsequent, their language is called simply the *Slav*, and nowhere the Bulgarian.[1] The great achievement of the foundation of Slav letters is in no way connected with the Bulgars.

Likewise the systematic spreading of Christianity among the Balkan Slavs by the disciples of Cyril and Method was also undertaken independently of the Bulgars.

The time when the Bulgars were establishing themselves in Macedonia coincides with the beginning of the persecution of the followers of Cyril and Method in Moravia. Some of them sought refuge in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian Tsar Boris (852–888) received them well, but did not keep them in Bulgaria, sending them on to Macedonia instead. Bulgaria was not a suitable field for the Slav preachers of Christianity.

Towards the end of the seventh century the Turanian Bulgars had destroyed the first harvest of the Gospel which Christian missionaries had sown among the Slavs before the arrival of the Bulgars in those countries which they subdued. A long time elapsed before we find fresh

[1] V. Djerić, Professor at the University of Belgrade, has studied all history sources from the ninth to the twelfth centuries, in which the language of the Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula of that period is mentioned, and found nowhere that the language of the earliest Slav books is called anything but *Slav*. There are no traces at all of the Bulgarian designation (V. Djerič, "O Srpskom imenu u Staroj Srbiji i Makedoniji" ("The term 'Serbian' in Old Serbia and Macedonia"), Belgrade, 1904, pp. 32–38.

attempts to introduce Christianity among the Bulgars. As with all barbarians, the work of converting them was fraught with difficulty. Even those who were baptized frequently reverted to their old faith. Neither were such of the Bulgarian sovereigns who adopted Christianity reliable converts. Tsar Boris, who became a Christian, abdicated about A.D. 888 in favour of his son Vladimir, but soon found himself compelled to resume the reins of government because the new Tsar renounced Christianity and reverted to paganism. Boris defeated him, blinded him for punishment, and placed his younger son Simeon upon the throne. Islam, too, had by this time taken considerable root among the Bulgars. Pope Nicholas mentions in a letter that Saracen books were found among the Bulgars. (*Libri profani, quos a Saracenis vos abstulisse ac apud vos habere perhibetis.*) Neither did the Bulgarian people, who still preserved many Turanian qualities in their pristine savagery, present a suitable field for the growth of Christianity. Finally, the Slav language in Bulgaria had not yet assumed a definite form.

In Macedonia, the cradle of Slav Christianity, conditions were altogether different. There the spreading of Christianity among the Slavs was not in any way impeded, but its progress was constantly maintained. There no Bulgarian influence interfered with the language. The Holy Scriptures could be understood by everybody. The race was pure and of settled habits. These were suitable conditions for the lofty mission of the persecuted Slav ministers of the Gospel from Moravia. For this reason Tsar Boris directed them to Macedonia. It is in Macedonia that the new era of Slav Christianity then began, with the Holy Scriptures no longer in

Greek, but in the Slav tongue, and with divine service celebrated in Slav. There were compiled fresh translations of the Christian writings, and there were laid the first foundations of Slav literature. This Slav Christianity made a vigorous start. From Macedonia its radiant beams spread in all directions—to Serbia, to Bulgaria, and to Russia.

This is the substratum of fact in the great legend of the part played by Bulgaria in the first introduction of Christianity and letters among the Slavs.

As uncivilized foreigners and invaders, the Bulgars could only be hated in Macedonia. That is why the Macedonian Slavs rebelled against them, drove them out, freed themselves and established a state of their own.

Thus ended the first Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, nor did there remain in Macedonia either ethnical traces of it or the legacy of a civilization.

The second Bulgarian rule in Macedonia represents an easily won success during an auspicious opportunity. It was short—only twenty-one years in all; far too short a time to alter the ethnic character of a large country. Moreover, this time also the Bulgars only garrisoned the towns without having intercourse with the native population or mingling with it. Lastly, the Bulgarian rule was so barbarous that it inspired nothing but loathing among the nation. The Bulgarian rulers were cruel and bloodthirsty tyrants. They knew no moderation in dealing with a conquered populace. Their *principes imperii* (Princes of the Empire) were mere savages. Frankish and Byzantine historians describe the disgusting cruelty of the Bulgarian Tsar Kalojan (1197–1207). Ivanko, the nephew and assassin of Tsar Asen I, used to have Greek prisoners executed during his banquets in order to add

zest to his revelry and enjoyment. This is a sample of the kind of rule the Bulgars brought to Macedonia. Strez, who was governor of part of Macedonia during the Bulgarian rule, is a fair representative of Bulgarian rule in Macedonia. In his castle at Prosek, perched on a rock high above the Vardar, he had a wooden platform built, where it was his custom, when he was in his cups, to condemn men to death for the slightest offence, causing them to be cast from the platform into the torrent of the Vardar far below. "While the poor wretches were being dashed to pieces on the rocks, he used to shout in mockery: 'Mind you do not spoil your skin!' There was no place for those cast down to fall, except the river. If a man was not rescued thence by some of his kinsfolk, or by godfearing men, or washed ashore by the waves, he remained in the river, and was devoured by the fish."

Thus a contemporary, who was perhaps an eye-witness of these horrors, describes the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia.[1] Such are the memories of the second Bulgarian rule in Macedonia.

* * * * *

Serbian rule in Macedonia bears quite a different character; it is bound up with altogether different memories.

The Serbs and the Macedonians are one and the same nation as regards origin, race, and civilization. There were no differences between them that had to be adjusted or equalized. The Serbs were not conquerors or aggressors in Macedonia, but liberators. Mediæval records refer to the Serbian rulers as the "liberators"

[1] "Život Svetoga Save" ("Life of St. Sava"), by Domentijan, ed. Dj. Daničić, Belgrade, 1860, p. 106.

(*osvoboditelji*) and "gatherers" (*savakupitelji*) into one realm of the whole Serbian nation.

The Serbs in Macedonia did not represent a ruling class, but the sons of a brother nation, who had brought freedom. They did not seek riches and booty in Macedonia, but themselves imported wealth and prosperity. At the time of her acquisition of Macedonia, Serbia had attained a high level of material prosperity. Her trade in minerals, agricultural produce, and cattle with her neighbours had so enhanced Serbia's reputation that even Bulgars left their country and emigrated to Serbia. The effects of the wealth of King Milutin were felt far beyond the borders of Serbia, in Constantinople, in Salonica and Jerusalem, where he built churches and hospitals for the poor. In Dušan's time Serbia was the richest country in the Balkan Peninsula. Dušan endowed monasteries "on a golden scale," and showered gifts in all directions.[1] On their entrance into Macedonia the Serbs caused the Macedonians to share in their freedom, prosperity, and wealth.

While the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia marked the acme of barbarity, the Serbian rule brought a golden era of Serbian civilization. Upon their entrance into Macedonia the Serbs destroyed and abolished nothing. It was the opposite that was the case. During the short time that he ruled in Skoplje, King Uroš confirmed the Church in all its old privileges which had been granted to it by the Bulgarian Tsar Asen II. Tsar Dušan overwhelmed the Monastery of St. Jovan Preteča—founded by the Greek Emperor Andronikos and situated near Serez—with his generosity, granted it certain rights and endowed it by patents specially drawn up in

[1] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. pp. 338, 391.

Greek.[1] All monasteries and holy places in Macedonia were respected by the Serbs. The Greek cities of Macedonia, which enjoyed special privileges under the Greek rule, were confirmed in these privileges by special decree.[2]

By acquiring Macedonia the Serbs merely extended to her the field for developing their civilization. While of the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia there remains not one typical church, nor painting, nor literary record, the mementoes of the rule of the Serbs in Macedonia are cogent proof of their presence there.

The list of churches and monasteries which the Serbs have either built or restored, or handsomely endowed in Macedonia, is a long one.[3]

By the consensus of expert opinion all these churches

[1] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija," p. 145.

[2] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. p. 386.

[3] We cannot refrain from mentioning at least some of the principal monasteries among those which the Serbian kings either built or restored in Macedonia, viz. the Church of *Our Blessed Redeemer* near Ćustendil, which Stephan Dečanski built to commemorate his victory over the Bulgars and to which we have already referred. King Milutin built the Church of *Our Blessed Lady Trojeručica* (with the three hands) at Skoplje; the Church of *St. George Nagoričinski* near Kumanovo; the Church of *St. John Sarandaporski* in the same neighbourhood; the Church of *St. George* on the River Spreva in Skoplje; *St. Constantine's* in Skoplje; the Church of *St. Nikita Martyr* near Skoplje. Dušan built the Church of *Our Blessed Lady* in Tetovo; the Monastery of *Treskavac* near Prilep; the Monastery of *Zrze* near Prilep; the Church of *St. John Preteča* near Serez. Tsar Uroš built the Church of *Our Blessed Lady* in Skoplje. King Vukašin and his sons built the Church of *St. Demitrius* (Marko's Monastery) near Skoplje. Tsar Simeon (Siniša) built the Churches of the *Holy Archangel* and *St. Elias* in Kostur; and the Church of *Our Blessed Lady* in Janjina. Ugleša built the Monastery of *Samotrepa*. Constantine Dejanović built the Monastery of *Osogovo* near Kriva Palanka. Despot Oliver built the Monastery of *Lesnovo* near Ištip. Hrelja built the Monastery of *Rilo* and the Church of the *Holy Archangel* in Ištip. Novak built the Church of *Our Blessed Lady* on the Isle Mali Grad in Lake Prespa, and so on.

are classified as examples of Serbian architecture, just the same as the monasteries in other Serbian countries. Many of these edifices are to-day in ruins; but so far as they have been preserved they bear witness to the high level of Serbian architecture and artistic taste at the time.

The images in them are also Serbian in character. And they bear yet another Serbian sign, viz. the representations of Serbian kings and worthies, and the Serbian legends on those pictures.[1]

When building churches and monasteries in Macedonia, the Serbian kings and princes liberally endowed them with money and other property, such as villages and tolls on produce, thus affording them facilities for becoming centres of education and learning. They were the seats of schools and literary studies. Many Serbian books on various subjects were penned within their walls.

[1] The Bulgarian agents have destroyed many of the paintings representing Serbian kings and princes and the legends referring to them in the churches and monasteries of Macedonia. Of those which have been preserved we will mention the paintings representing St. Sava, the first Serbian Archbishop of Serbia; those of Tsar Uroš and King Marko in the Church of St. Demitrius near Skoplje; that of King Milutin in the Church of St. George Nagoričinski; representations of King Dušan, Queen Jelena, and the Kraljević Uroš in the Monastery of St. Nicholas near Skoplje; paintings of Tsar Uroš and King Vukašin in the Church of St. Nicholas in Psača (near Kumanovo); paintings representing Tsar Dušan, Tsaritsa Jelena, Despot Oliver and his wife Marija in the Monastery of Lesnovo; those of Tsar Dušan, Tsaritsa Jelena, and their son Uroš in the Monastery of St. John Preteča near Serez; painting representing King Vukašin in the Church of the Holy Archangel in Prilep, and the picture of King Marko in the church near Prilep. Paintings representing Stephan Nemanja, St. Sava, Stephan Dečanski, King Milutin, Tsar Uroš, Miloš Obilić, etc., have been preserved in the churches and monasteries in Skopska Crna Gora (Montenegro). "Everywhere these pictures were given the most prominent positions" (Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, "Naselja Srpskih Zemalja") ("Settlement of the Serbian Lands"), vol. iii. pp. 500–507.

Besides those written in the Macedonian monasteries, many contemporary Serbian books written elsewhere have also been preserved. In all of these it is mentioned that they were written during the reign of such and such a Serbian ruler, or prince of the Church, and on Serbian territory. Not one of them mentions Bulgars, except in so far as some of these books commemorate victories over the Bulgars.[1]

Speaking of the Serbian literary monuments in Macedonia, we must not forget to mention the most important among them, perhaps the most important of all the Serbian literary records of the Middle Ages, viz. Dušan's Code. This celebrated achievement of Serbian literature and civilization was compiled in Macedonia, in Skoplje and Serez, at the State Councils (Sabor) of 1349 and 1354.

Under the Bulgarian rule Macedonia was a mere province of secondary importance, a march of the Bulgarian Empire. Under the Serbian rule Macedonia was the centre of the life of the Empire. As soon as King Milutin had taken Skoplje he made it the capital of Serbia. Dušan spent nearly the whole of his reign in Macedonia, where he had many royal residences. In Prilep he built an Imperial palace for himself. The winters of 1354 and 1355 he spent in his palace at Serez. Serez was the residence of Tsaritsa Jelena, Dušan's wife. She continued to live there even after she had taken the veil. Serez was subsequently the capital of Jovan Uglješa. Prilep was the permanent capital of King Vukašin and King Marko. Branko Mladenović made Ochrid his capital, and all the other

[1] See Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 34, 43, 56, 75, 102, 103, 4944.

Serbian princes who ruled in Macedonia likewise had their capitals there.

Most important events in Serbia's domestic history took place in Macedonia, the heart of Serbian State life, and the fate of the Serbian nation was decided within her borders. In Macedonia were held those Serbian State Assemblies or Councils (Sabor=Assembly, Council; Sabor Srpski = Serbian Council; Sabor Zemlje Srpske = Serbian Land Council; Sabor otačastvija = Council of the Fatherland, as these assemblies are actually called in old historic records) at which most far-reaching decisions were taken. We have already referred to two of these Councils, those of Skoplje and Serez, at which Dušan's Code was compiled. At the Council of Skoplje in 1346, Serbia was proclaimed an Empire, and Dušan crowned the first Serbian Tsar. At the same Council the Archbishopric of Serbia was raised to the rank of a Patriarchate. The Bishopric of Lesnovo was created at the Council of Skoplje in 1347. At the Council of Serez in 1354 a new Patriarch was appointed. A Council was held in Krupište, south of Kostur, in 1355. In 1357 there was another Council in Skoplje, and so forth.

It was in Macedonia that Serbia not only achieved her full strength and significance, but also her complete external development. It was there that on Easter Sunday, April 17, 1346, Serbia proclaimed herself an Empire at the State Council in Skoplje. The greatest day in Serbia's past was celebrated in Macedonia, when Serbia became an Empire and the Serbian King and Queen were proclaimed Tsar and Tsaritsa. There the new Serbian Imperial Palace became the equal of that in Constantinople in splendour, ceremonial, and its attendant nobility.

Such are the memories bequeathed to Macedonia by the Serbian rule. While national tradition in Macedonia does not retain even the slightest memento of the Bulgarian rule, it cherishes naught but events from the Serbian past, and none but heroes of Serbian history.

Such was the Serbian rule in Macedonia.

* * * * *

Macedonia undoubtedly also influenced Serbia. But even here we find no trace of anything Bulgarian. It was purely a Greek influence. Macedonia is an old Greek province. Although after the immigration of the Slavs the population became Slav in the majority, yet Greek civilization remained strong within her. Very frequently in the cities the Greeks were in the majority. They already possessed Christianity; ecclesiastical power, literature, higher civilization, the learned professions, commerce, and administration were all in their hands. All of this subsequently passed over to the Serbs in Macedonia. During the Serbian rule in Macedonia the memory of the Greek domination was still quite fresh. For this reason Macedonia is sometimes referred to as the "Greek country" in old Serbian records. Nor were the Greeks or Greek literature in any way suppressed by the Serbian sovereigns. The latter styled themselves rulers of the "Serbs and Greeks." The State ceremonial, official titles, the life of the Court and Serbian usage of that age in many ways betray the Greek influence. This was Serbia's experience in conquering Macedonia, an experience which continued to gain strength in time, in spite of her being already under the influence of Byzantine culture. Of the Bulgars and Bulgarian influence in Macedonia, Serbia felt nothing, nor could she have felt anything, for indeed there was none left in Macedonia.

VII

TURKISH RULE IN MACEDONIA

Complete disappearance of the Bulgars under Turkish rule—Serbian national life not arrested by Turkish conquest—Macedonians remain Serbian under Turkish rule—Significance of the independent Serbian Patriarchate for the Serbian nation during the Turkish rule—Macedonia an integral part of the Serbian Patriarchate

WITH the fall of Macedonia under the Turkish domination, every connection between her and Serbia was severed. Surely this was the moment for the Macedonians to prove what they truly were. And they proved it. During the whole time of the Turkish rule in Macedonia, the Macedonians have remained Serbs. Meantime there were no causes at work which might have wrought changes to the advantage of the Bulgars. The Bulgarian Empire was conquered by the Turkish during the Turkish invasion of 1393, before the final fall of Macedonia. Bulgaria disappeared completely under the Turkish rule, and for centuries she was as utterly unknown as though she did not exist. "Under the Turks, the Bulgars ceased to exist as a nation; they were only a host of individuals, oppressed, vanquished, and reduced to abject misery. Even the designation 'nation' (*jazik*) had disappeared, and its place was taken by the word *khora*, which means a multitude, a rabble of ignorant folk, condemned to labour and to forced labour." Such

is the description of the Bulgars during the Turkish rule, by the Bulgarian historian M. Drinov, a Bulgar by nationality, Professor at the University of Harkow and the first Minister of Public Instruction in resuscitated Bulgaria.[1] How could a Bulgaria in this condition have had any power to Bulgarize the Serbian people of Macedonia under the Turkish rule?

As regards the Serbs, the case was different. Therefore the Serbian sentiment of the Macedonians never flagged. The Serbian principalities north of Macedonia survived the fall of Macedonia for many years (Serbia until 1459, Bosnia until 1463, Hercegovina until 1482, Zeta until 1499). So long as these States survived, Macedonia looked upon them as a pledge of hope for liberation from the Turks and the return of the conditions which prevailed before the Turkish conquest. The story of the fall of the Serbian States teems with glorious examples of heroic fighting and self-sacrifice, which have enriched the popular traditions of Macedonia even as they enriched those of every other Serbian country. Nor did the Serbs disappear under the Turks. The entire history of the Turkish Empire in the Balkan Peninsula is strongly interwoven with Serbia's share, in which the Macedonians always played a thoroughly Serbian part. They were staunch guardians of their national Serbian feeling, their Serbian churches and monasteries, Serbian culture and history. Finally, they were also warriors for the liberation of the Serbian people from the Turkish yoke.

Under the Turkish rule it was an accepted fact that the nation which possessed an autonomous Church also retained its status and significance as a nation. Christians who had no autonomous Church were simply so many

[1] "Periodičeskoe Spisanie," iv. p. 4 (in Bulgarian).

Turkish subjects, without any nationality or status of their own. The Bulgars had no autonomous church under the Turkish rule. When the Turks conquered the Bulgarian Empire they likewise abolished the Bulgarian autonomous Patriarchate in Trnovo, and affiliated it to the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople. This is one of the chief reasons why the Bulgars even in their own fatherland "had no existence as a nation" under the Turks, but only as a "host of individuals." Even under the Turkish rule the Serbs retained their autonomous Church. The Serbian autonomous Patriarchate of Ipek, whose spiritual powers extended over Macedonia also, continued in many respects to embody the *rôle* played formerly by the Serbian State. Herein lies the reason why the Serbian nation has everywhere, including Macedonia, preserved the national Serbian consciousness.

The autonomous Churches possessed a vast significance under the Turkish regime. They were, so far as Turkish abuses permitted, a kind of *imperium in imperio*. They were absolutely independent as regards the religious and national affairs of their adherents. In all the autonomous Christian Churches in Turkey the election of the Patriarch and all other dignitaries of the Church was free. The Sultan was merely entitled to confirm them in their dignities. The Patriarch was the highest spiritual authority, and the supreme guardian of the national interests of his people. He was not only allowed full freedom to exercise his spiritual functions, but also to protect national traditions, customs, and institutions, so long as these did not clash with the interests of the Turkish State. The ecclesiastical authorities were entitled to administer justice. Not only religious matters and the clergy came under their jurisdiction, but they

were the real temporal courts of justice in all matters arising from the rites and ordinances of the Church. All questions pertaining to marriage and divorce were dealt with by the spiritual courts. Even the question of the dowry, the maintenance of a divorced wife, and the care of the children of divorced parents were dealt with by these courts. They were empowered also to administer the laws dealing with wills and bequests, the question of inheritance, the adoption of children, and everything else in any way connected with religious observance. The Church was also the authority in educational matters. Schools, letters and literature were the exclusive province of the clergy. A nation possessing no Church autonomy under the Turks was also without the means of safeguarding its civilization. The Church parish, which existed everywhere under the Turkish rule, was an institution within whose scope the nation was entitled to minister to its spiritual and national needs. Through it the higher dignitaries of the Church were in touch with the common people. From the patriarch on his throne to the poorest of the poor all were in direct touch, and all were imbued with the same religious and national spirit.

The Serbian prelates were the chiefest and most eloquent representatives of the unity and solidarity of the nation. As such they were its natural envoys and representatives in all its relations with the Turkish Government and its officials. On behalf of their people they concluded treaties with the Turks, protested against acts of injustice, offered themselves as hostages for the sake of the people, and exposed themselves to endless dangers. The lesser clergy and the people obeyed them; they submitted to the guidance of the princes of the

Church and every notable act was connected with them. If a church were built, if a picture were painted in a church, if a book were written, copied or transcribed, or a well constructed, there was always inscribed upon them that this was work done during the reign of such and such a Patriarch or Bishop. The names of the Serbian prelates, as inscribed in these legends, seem as though they were the names of temporal sovereigns.

So great was the part played by the autonomous Churches under the Turkish rule. Such a part devolved also upon the autonomous Church of Serbia, whose domain at all times included Macedonia also.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE LOSS OF HER INDEPENDENCE TO THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE (1413–1459)

The *rôle* of the Serbian State devolves upon the Serbian Patriarchate —Character of the Serbian Patriarchate—Serbian sentiment among the Macedonian clergy—Serbian sentiment among the Macedonian people—The Macedonians seek refuge only among Serbs—They feel among kinsmen with the Serbs—Part played by Macedonians among the Serbs as a whole

MACEDONIA'S independence, as we have seen, was not totally destroyed by the Turks until about 1413. After the Turks had wrested Macedonia from the Serbs, the *rôle* of the Serbian State in Macedonia was taken over by the autonomous Patriarchate of Serbia, whose seat was in Ipek. Not until the fall of the Serbian State on the Morava and Danube in 1459 did the Turks also dissolve the Serbian Patriarchate.

During the time of the Serbian Patriarchate, none but Serbs occupied the Patriarchal throne. All episcopal thrones dependent upon the Patriarchate See, were likewise occupied by bishops who were Serbs. All the parish priests and the monks were Serbs. In all Serbian countries, as well as in Macedonia, all the churchmen taught and upheld the religious, intellectual, and national traditions of the old Serbian State life. With the help

of the populace they built new churches and monasteries, and restored the old ones.[1] Within these churches and monasteries, divine service continued to be celebrated in the same tongue as it had been in the days of the Serbian Empire. The clergy, the only scholars of that age, carried on their Old Serbian literary tradition, adding to and transcribing the extensive material of Old Serbian literature. Serbian literary records of those days are to be found in Skoplje, Mlado Nagoricino, and elsewhere.[2] How strong was the Serbian sentiment of the Macedonian scribes and chroniclers of those days may be shown by an example. In 1434 a monk of Skoplje who lived in the village of Vitomirci, near Skoplje, made a copy of one of the Gospels. In dating his work he mentions that he wrote it "in the seventh year after the death of the Honourable Despot Stephan (Stephan, son of Lazar, Despot of Serbia, 1389–1427), in the Empire of the infidel Emperor Murat."[3] What caused this monk, so long after the fall of Macedonia, and so far from the free Serbian States, to remember the Serbian Prince, and to mention the death of Despot Stephan in dating his work? Does he not give expression to the general popular feeling of the Macedonians towards the Serbian princes?

Side by side with the Serbian sympathies of the Macedonian clergy we find records of similar feelings among the mass of the people. The Serbian people did not fare well in "the Empire of the infidel Emperor

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), i. Nos. 254, 273. J. H. Vasiljević, "Pritep i nijegova Okolina" ("Prilep and its Environs"), p. 84.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), i. Nos. 261, 313, etc.

[3] Ibid., No. 261.

Murat." That is why so many fled from it. The stream of emigration began during the earliest days of the Turkish conquest of Serbian territory in 1371, and afterwards proceeded uninterruptedly. Until the fall of Bulgaria in 1393 there were two countries open to the Macedonian refugees—Bulgaria and Serbia. Under such circumstances the chance of refuge among one's own people is the deciding factor. There were no emigrants from Macedonia to Bulgaria; they all fled to Serbia. One of the first notable refugees was the Lady Jefimia, widow of the Serbian Despot Uglješa whose throne was in Serez, as we have said before. Vuk Branković, the son of Branko Mladenović, lord of Ochrida and its neighbourhood, is mentioned subsequently to 1371 as living in Serbia as lord of part of Kosovo Polje and the surrounding territory.[1]

What applies to the refugees we have mentioned, applies also to the nation at large. The common people likewise fled to Serbia, or in any case took refuge among Serbs. After the battle on the Marica in 1371, great numbers of plain men from Macedonia with their families and household goods took refuge in Serbia. Some of the refugees from Macedonia went to Montenegro,[2] and others to other Serbian countries. Wherever they went they were received as true Serbs. A party of Macedonians who emigrated from Kratovo and its surroundings and fled to the Serbs in Ragusa, were at once received as Ragusan citizens,[3] and this was a privilege never extended by the Ragusans to aliens.

[1] Lj. Kovačević, "Vuk Branković," Belgrade, 1888, p. 15.

[2] G. S. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik" ("A Traveller through the Mountains"), Novi Sad, 1857, pp. 267–268 (in Bulgarian).

[3] St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci" ("Serbs and Turks"), pp. 184–185.

The descendants of Macedonian emigrants very frequently distinguished themselves and became the pride of the Serbian nation. The ancestors of Dinko Zlatarić, one of the greatest of the Serbian poets of Ragusa, emigrated from Macedonia to Ragusa in those days.[1] All this happened while the Bulgarian Empire still existed. It is surely not due merely to chance that the stream of emigration from Macedonia was—in spite of the existence of a free Bulgaria—directed exclusively towards Serbia and the rest of the Serbian countries.

This trend of the stream of emigrants from among the Serbs of Macedonia towards Serbia and Serbian countries, which was due to the national kinship, persisted equally after the fall of the Bulgarian Empire. It is also a noteworthy fact that after the fall of their Empire the Bulgars themselves did not emigrate to Serbia or to Serbian countries, but went mostly to Roumania and, later on, from the eighteenth century onward, to South Russia.[2]

In their new home among the Serbs, the Macedonian emigrants felt as though they were in their own country. During the Turkish domination the Serbs of other Serbian countries, too, found themselves compelled to emigrate elsewhere, especially to Hungary. Wherever they went, the emigrants from Macedonia and those from other Serbian lands felt as though they were one nation. Possessing the same language, the same customs, a common past, common historic traditions

[1] P. Budmani, "Djela Dominika Zlatarića" ("The Works of Dominic Zlatarić"), Zagreb, 1899, p. ix.

[2] G. S. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik" ("A Traveller through the Mountains"), p. 271. A. N. Pipin and V. D. Spasovič, "Istorija Slavjanskih Literatur" ("History of Slav Literature"), Petrograd, 1879, p. 139 (in Russian).

and common aspirations touching the preservation of their common nationality, they established their Serbian parishes jointly; jointly they built churches, opened schools and jointly they faced every danger. This fact was noted long ago even by the Bulgars.[1]

Among the emigrant Serbs some of those who had originally emigrated from Macedonia distinguished themselves considerably. After the death of the Serbian King Marko of Macedonia in 1394, his brothers Dmitar and Andrejaš left Macedonia and settled among the Ragusan Serbs. The Ragusans received them cordially and delivered to them a certain treasure which their father, unknown to them, had in former years entrusted to the care of Ragusa. From Ragusa the Macedonian princes proceeded to Hungary, where there were already large numbers of Serbian emigrants from Macedonia and other Serbian territories. Historic records of 1404 and 1407 mention Dimitrije (Dmitar) as Grand Župan of Zarand and Royal Commandant of the city of Villagoš, where there were many Serbian emigrants.[2]

[1] G. S. Rakovski, one of the greatest Bulgarian chauvinists, mentions that the Macedonian emigrants in Srem and South Hungary called themselves Serbs and Greeks (G. S. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik," pp. 267–268).

[2] St. Novaković, "Srbi i Turci" ("Serbs and Turks"), p. 247.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE TO ITS RESTORATION (1459–1557)

Suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate and its supersession by the Archiepiscopate of Ochrida—Greek character of the Archiepiscopate—Slav and Serbian clergy in it—Detriment caused to the Serbian nation by the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Vitality of the Serbian nation—The Archiepiscopate of Ochrida "Serbicized"—Sad plight of the Serbian people in those days—Serbian literature barely kept alive in Macedonia—Serbian sentiment of the clergy in Macedonia—Serbian historic records and sources call the Macedonians "Serbs"—Other historic sources do the same

IN 1459 the Turks suppressed the Serbian Patriarchate and transferred the administration of the Church to the self-governing Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida.

The Archbishopric of Ochrida was founded by St. Clement (*ob.* 916), a disciple of SS. Cyril and Method, who had come to Macedonia from Moravia. At the time of its foundation the Archiepiscopal See received the rank of a Patriarchate. As it was founded under the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia, it was called the Bulgarian Patriarchate. The official title of the Archbishop of Ochrida was "Patriarch (afterwards Archbishop) of Justiniana Prima and all Bulgaria." While the Bulgarians ruled in Macedonia the Patriarch of Ochrida was the head of the Bulgarian Church.

When the Macedonians expelled the Bulgars from Macedonia in 969, Ochrida remained the independent Church of the Empire of Samuel and his successors. When the Emperor of Byzantium in 1018 overthrew Samuel's State, he respected the self-governing Patriarchate of Ochrida and maintained it in its autocephalous rights and territories, merely reducing it to the rank of an archbishopric. The contemporary Patriarch John, a Slav from Debar, from being a Patriarch was reduced to being an Archbishop. Right up to his death in 1037 the Slav character of this autonomous Archbishopric was maintained. After his death the See of Ochrida assumed the character of a Greek Church. The Emperor Michael IV Paphlagonian of Byzantium, even deprived the people and clergy of the diocese of Ochrida of the right of electing their archbishop, and made his appointment dependent upon the throne of Byzantium.

From that time until the second half of the eighteenth century, when the Archbishopric was abolished, all its archbishops were Greeks, with the exception of a few who were Serbs. The official language of the prelacy was Greek.[1] From 1018 to 1219 all Serbian territories were under the See of Ochrida, but it nevertheless retained its Greek character. When in 1219 the independence of the Serbian Church was proclaimed, the Archbishop of Ochrida protested, as head of the Greek Church. The See of Ochrida preserved its Greek character also during the time of the Serbian rule in Macedonia. Moreover, the Serbian Tsar Dušan respected

[1] B. Prokić, "Prvi ochridski arhiepiskop Jovan"—"Jovan, first Archbishop of Ochrida" ("Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lxxxviii. pp. 268, 284, 296). P. Popović, "Serbian Macedonia," London, 1916, pp. 22, etc.

its autonomy and all its rights and privileges. Archbishop Nicholas of Ochrida assisted at Dušan's coronation as Tsar, and also took part in the Serbian State Councils, like the other Serbian prelates, but his title continued to be "Hierarch of the Greek throne."[1] This Greek character of the Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida was maintained also during the Turkish rule.

The Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida had no further connection with the Bulgars after their expulsion from Macedonia in 969. The attribute "Bulgarian" in the Archbishop's title represented only a faded tradition, a relic, preserved like all other similar relics in titles, without significance or importance.[2] The epithet "Bulgarian" was retained in the title of the Archbishop of Ochrida equally when Ochrida became a recognized Slav See, when it became Greek, and when it definitely received a Greek character. In 1186 the Bulgars received an independent Patriarchate of their own in Trnovo in Bulgaria, but nevertheless the Archbishop of Ochrida continued to style himself "Primate of all Bulgaria." Thus he styled himself during the Serbian rule, during the Turkish rule, at a time when Serbian archbishops were occupying the archiepiscopal throne of Ochrida, and all the time until it was suppressed.

In speaking of the Greek character of the See of Ochrida, we are referring only to its prelates—its archbishops and bishops. The minor clergy, who were

[1] C. Jireček, "Staat und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Serbien," i. p. 58. B. Prokić, "Prvi ohridski arhiepiskop Jovan," p. 279.

[2] The Byzantine historian N. Gregoras says that after the Bulgars were expelled from Macedonia the epithet "Bulgarian" was retained in the title of the Archbishop of Ochrida merely as a relic (N. Gregoras, ed. Bonn, p. 27).

in direct contact with the people and attended to the religious ministrations in the parishes, were not Greek, but Slav, in all parts where the Slavs formed the compact population. They were Slav almost immediately after the arrival of the Slavs in Macedonia even before the foundation of the Patriarchate of Ochrida.[1] When Christianity first spread among the Macedonian Slavs and the Slav St. Clement established the Slav Archbishopric of Ochrida, the majority of the clergy were Slavs. During the Greek rule in Macedonia, the archbishops of Ochrida persecuted the Slav clergy and letters, but without success, because both were favoured by the people.[2] During the Serbian rule in Macedonia the minor clergy of Ochrida were Serbian. Under the Turkish rule all this simply remained just as it had been under the Serbian rule. Many legends and inscriptions from the immediate vicinity of the archiepiscopal diocese of Ochrida, dating from the time of the Turkish rule, are in Serbian.[3]

It was an Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida with Greek prelates and a Slav minor clergy to which the Turks subjected the Serbian Patriarchate in 1459.

By the loss of the Patriarchate the Serbian people sustained a grievous blow. The head of the Serbian Church, the guardian of the national conscience and civilization, had ceased to exist. The Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida was merely a religious institution, independent as regards administration, finance, etc., the civilization of which was Greek. It did not represent

[1] C. Jireček, "Gesch. d. Serben," i. pp. 174–175.

[2] B. Prokić, "Prvi ohridski arhiepiskop Jovan" ("Jovan, first Archbishop of Ochrida"), p. 296.

[3] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 300, 461, 522, etc.

Greek national claims. Greek national interests were represented by the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople, and between the two there was never-ending friction. The Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople was hostile to the See of Orchrida as well as to the Serbian Patriarchate. In its intrigues[1] against the Archiepiscopal See of Ochrida the Greek Patriarchate was finally successful in having it suppressed by the Turks in 1767. Still, the Patriarchate of Ochrida had not been much of a protector of Serbian national aspirations. The Serbian people were not satisfied with it. In 1531 a Serbian bishop endeavoured to restore the Serbian Patriarchate.

After the Serbian Church was deprived of its independence, the nation was left absolutely unprotected, and only to its own moral strength and vitality did it owe the preservation of its national consciousness. That strength, however, was so great that even in those adverse times it succeeded in impairing the Greek character of the Archiepiscopacy of Ochrida. The diocese of Ochrida had even in former times been in the very heart of Serbian territory. By having its power extended over the territory of the Serbian Patriarchate, its population became overwhelmingly Serbian. The natural result of this was that even around the archiepiscopal throne of Ochrida the breath of Serbian influence began to make itself felt. Already in 1466, only seven years after the dissolution of the Serbian Patriarchate, Archbishop Marko of Ochrida caused a *Serbian* translation to be made of the "Canon of the great Archiepiscopal Church," which had so far not been transcribed into Serbian, but existed

[1] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. p. 282.

only in Greek.[1] Why should the Archbishop of Ochrida require the "Canon of the Great Church" in Serbian when he already possessed it in Greek?

But this is not all. From this time forward we find Serbia represented in the titles of the Archbishop of Ochrida. Already in 1466 we find Archbishop Dorotheus of Ochrida styled prince "of the Serbian land," and "Archbishop . . . of the Serbs."[2] This style was likewise adopted by succeeding archbishops of Ochrida.[3]

Moreover, the Archbishops of Ochrida were perfectly acquainted with the Serbian language. In 1548, as Archbishop Prohor of Ochrida was staying in Janjevo in Kosovo, he with his own hand, in the purest Serbian literary language of the period, made an entry in a "Tetraevangel" (The Four Gospels) to the effect that he was at the time in Janjevo and that a certain tailor, Peter by name, had on that occasion presented this Evangel to the Church of the Blessed Archangel in Janjevo.[4] Last, but not least, we find Serbs installed upon the archiepiscopal throne. We have positive records of two. Perhaps there were more. The first one is Simeon, who became Archbishop of Ochrida in 1550, after having previously been Metropolitan of Roška. The second was a nephew of the first Serbian Patriarch of the restored Patriarchate of Serbia. He was appointed Archbishop of Ochrida in 1574.[5]

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 828.

[2] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. vii. pp. 177, 178; vol. xlvii. p. 271.

[3] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 547, 552, etc.

[4] Ibid., No. 547. [5] P. Popović, "Serbian Macedonia," pp. 27–28.

Thus, instead of deriving protection from the See of Ochrida, the Serbian people created a protection for itself out of its own strength. In this way the Serbian national tradition was not interrupted in Macedonia even during the time while the Serbian Patriarchate was suppressed. The churches built by the people during that period were decorated with pictures of Serbian saints, especially St. Simeon (Stephan Nemanja) and St. Sava (Stephan Nemanja's son, first archbishop of Serbia).[1]

The Turks were at this time at the zenith of their power. The Serbian people—without leaders, without a national Church or any other national centre of spiritual and intellectual life, without directive—passed through a grievous time. Deserted villages, churches laid waste, her inhabitants driven into exile, fields overgrown with weeds—this is the picture of Serbia during that age. Learning and letters had practically disappeared. Only in the recesses of the mountains, and in sequestered spots removed from the trail of the Turks, do we still find a few feeble remnants of both. The literary output of the Macedonian Serbs during this period is represented only by a few insignificant transcriptions, mostly of sacred writings, and these made only so that the literary contact might not be lost altogether. From the year 1515 we have a "Troparnik" (collection of sacred songs) in Ištip; a "book of Prayer," transcribed in 1526, in Kratovo; a "Mineos," transcribed in 1545, in the Monastery of Slepče; and the Sermons of John Zlatousti (St. Chrysostom), transcribed in 1547 in the Monastery of St. John Preteča, and a few

[1] P. Kondakov, "Makedonija," Petrograd, p. 186 (in Russian).

more similar works.[1] The scribes were all Macedonians.[2]

This was as much as the Serbian nation could achieve in that age. But if it was not enough to improve the wretched state of the Macedonian Serbs, it was on the other hand sufficient to reveal their Serbian sentiment. The scanty notes in the books and MSS. of that time sorrowfully, as from a living grave, sigh for the glories of the Serbian past in Macedonia; though laconically brief they clearly reveal the Serbian spirit of the nation in Macedonia. "O most pious Tsar Stephan, where art thou now?" is the cry of a short entry penned by a sixteenth-century monk of the Monastery of Treskovac, near Prilep, on the margin of an original diploma from the hand of the Serbian Tsar Dušan.[3]

Thus did the Macedonians give expression to their Serbian sentiments in those dark days.

Serbian writers of that age, no matter whence they hailed, considered Macedonia a Serbian country. Vladislav Gramatik, a Serbian writer of the second half of the fifteenth century, looks upon Macedonia as Serbian. Referring to the battle of the Marica, he says that "the Serbian army was beaten to its knees (lit. feet) on the river which is called the Marica."[4] In a short history of the Serbian Tsars, dating from 1503, we find

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 425, 455, 532, 546, 573, 5611, etc.

[2] Some of the scribes say that they are from Debar (Serb., "Rodom iz Debra"); some say they are from the region of Debar (Serb., "iz debarskog predela") "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi," Nos. 546, 573; one says he is from Ištip (Serb., "iz Štipa"), ibid., No. 425.

[3] I. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep," p. 89.

[4] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. p. 287.

"the Serbs of Serez"[1] mentioned. On February 11, 1515, a pious Serbian youth from Kratovo was burned alive by the Turks, because he refused to renounce his faith. The Serbian Church canonized him under the name of St. George Kratovac (St. George of Kratovo). In writing the life-story of this saint, his countryman the priest Peja says that he was a Serb (of "Serbian stock").[2] There was in those days a Serbian printing-press in Venice. In view of the decline of Serbian letters and literature, Vuk Buković, the owner, appealed in 1546 by letter to all notable Serbs of "Macedonia, Serbia, Bosnia, Srem, and other Princes and elders (*starešnia*) great and small who write in this (the Serbian) tongue" to send him "old Serbian books written in the Serbian lands so that he may reprint them."[3]

Foreign writers of note and others who were acquainted with Balkan conditions at the time likewise considered Macedonia a Serbian country. In the fifteenth century two monks of Greek nationality, Komnenos and Prokles, wrote a history of the princes of Epirus. Incidentally they mention that Dušan's half-brother Simeon was overthrown by Nikephoros his brother-in-law, and exiled to Kostur. Simeon settled there, conquered several towns and made himself strong. "When he had been joined by many Greeks, *Serbs*, and Albanians" he gathered an army of some four or five

[1] P. I. Šafarik, "Pamatky drevniho pismenictva Jihoslovanuv," Prague, 1873, p. 55 (in Czech).

[2] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxi. p. 115. On February 11, 1915, in the midst of the miseries of the present war, the martyrdom of St. George Kratovac was solemnly commemorated by the Kratovo inhabitants.

[3] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 534.

thousand men, and "proclaimed himself Tsar."[1] In his narrative of the battle of the Marica, the Greek historian L. Chalcocondyla says of King Vukašin and Uglješa that they were "*Serbian* vojvodes."[2] Speaking of Macedonia, the Hungarian historian Ant. Bonfini, writing towards the end of the fifteenth century, says that "it is now called Serbia" ("Macedoniam quam Serbiam nunc appellant").[3]

After the dissolution of the Serbian Patriarchate, Macedonia remained a *Serbian country*, and its inhabitants remained *Serbs*.

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xiv. p. 238.

[2] "L. Chalcocondylæ Atheniensis Histor.," p. 30, ed. Bonn.

[3] "Ant. Bonfini rerum Hungaricarum," dec. i., lib. ix., Viennæ, 1744, p. 248*a*.

VII (*Continued*)

MACEDONIA FROM THE RESTORATION OF THE SERBIAN PATRIARCHATE TO ITS SECOND SUPPRESSION (1557–1766)

Restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate—Jurisdiction of the restored Serbian Patriarchate based on the principle of nationality—Reorganization of the Church; the standard of religion, literature, and national life raised within the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate—Increased importance of the Serbian Patriarchs—Their relations with foreign Powers—Hard lot of the Serbs in Macedonia—Macedonian missions solicit help in Russia for Serbian Churches—These missions call themselves "Serbian"—The Serbian migrations—Macedonian emigrants everywhere call themselves "Serbian"—Relations between Macedonian emigrants and Macedonian Serbs—Migrations *en masse* from Macedonia to Austria under Patriarch Arsenije III—Serbian sentiment of Macedonian emigrants in Austria—*Rôle* of Macedonians among the Serbs in Austria—Serbian historic records speak of Macedonians as "Serbs"—So do all non-Serbian historic records—Suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Protest by the Metropolitan of Montenegro against this crime against the Serbian nation as a whole, of which the Macedonians also form part

FOR nearly one hundred years the Serbian people were left without their Patriarchate. Towards the middle of the sixteenth century a Serb from Hercegovina, who had been taken away by the Turks in his childhood and brought up as a Moslem, attained the highest dignity in the Turkish Empire, that of Grand Vizier. This was the great Mehmed Sokolović. At the request of his brother Makarije, a monk in the

Monastery of Mileševo in Hercegovina, and moved perhaps also by sentimental regard for his own origin, Mehmed Sokolović in 1557 obtained the restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate with its seat in Ipek, as before. The first Patriarch of the restored Patriarchate was the Vizier's own brother Makarije.

But whereas formerly the power of the Serbian Patriarchate extended only as far as the frontiers of the old Serbian State, the restored Patriarchate embraced the entire Serbian nation. In establishing the jurisdiction of the restored Patriarchate, the Turks were guided by the principle of nationality. In accordance with this principle the new Patriarchate embraced not only contemporary Serbia but all other Serbian lands within the Turkish Empire, viz. Bosnia, Hercegovina, Dalmatia, Slavonia, and the rest of the Serbian territory to-day included in Austria-Hungary. Macedonia, as an integral part of the old Serbian State and also on the strength of the principle of nationality, was likewise placed under the Serbian Patriarchate. The impression which the Turks derived of Macedonia at that period was that it was impossible to discriminate between her and the rest of the Serbian countries. At every step in Macedonia the Turks came upon either the graves of Serbian princes and nobles, or their cities, churches, monasteries, bridges, and other buildings linked with their names; or fields where the Serbs had waged battles, or other spots which popular tradition connected with them, such as Dušan's Bridge in Skoplje, Marko's Cave in the Demir Kapija, Marko's Footstep, etc. In the monasteries of Macedonia the monks copied old Serbian MSS. and taught the Serbian language. The common people in their traditions spoke

only of the Serbian past, and had never in their lives followed other than Serbian customs. To whom, therefore, could the Turks have assigned Macedonia, except to the Serbian Patriarchate? Tetovo, Skoplje, Kratovo, Zletovo, Ištip, and Radovište were placed under it. Only the southern part of Macedonia—Ochrida, Monastir, Debar, and Prilep—remained under the Archiepiscopate of Ochrida.[1]

With the restoration of the Patriarchate the Serbian nation renewed its strength and vitality. The Serbian Patriarchs strenuously set about the reorganization of the Serbian Church, which had greatly fallen into decay, and that of the already exhausted Serbian people. This is not a history of the Serbian Patriarchs, but of the Serbian people as a whole, and therefore we cannot go into their magnificent work for the Serbian nation. We will limit ourselves solely to what concerns Macedonia.

No sooner had the new Patriarch taken over the administration of the Serbian Patriarchate than he at once reorganized the Churches in Macedonia. He restored the old bishoprics and created new ones, attended to the building and restoring of churches and monasteries and the improvement of church literature. His successors followed zealously in his footsteps. Patriarchs and bishops visited the eparchies and sent their exarchs to study the condition of the churches, monasteries, priests, and people. The Church expanded in Macedonia. The catalogue of literary productions in Macedonia assumed considerable dimensions.[2] The

[1] P. Popović, "Serbian Macedonia," p. 16.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 5611, 5614, 5618, 812, 900, 2234, 629, 752, 1001.

Patriarchs set the example in writing books.[1] "With their own hands" they presented books to the Churches and Monasteries of Macedonia.[2] The trade in books began to flourish. Already in about 1570 Skoplje possessed a bookseller's store, the depôt of the Serbian books printed by the Serbian printing press in Venice.[3] Serbian books produced in Macedonia are likewise mentioned.[4] From the highest dignitary of the Serbian Church to the lowest peasant, contact and unanimity were established. The entire Serbian nation experienced a vigorous religious and national revival.

In the restored Patriarchate the *rôle* of the Serbian Patriarchs was greater and more important than it had been before. The Patriarchs did not merely confine themselves to fostering and cherishing the Christian faith and the Serbian name, but they went much farther. They began to labour for the organization of national defence against the Turks. Not unlike the Prince-Bishops of Montenegro, they became a kind of Serbian temporal rulers within the Turkish Empire. At their word, entire Serbian counties rebelled against the Turks, and in peace negotiations they represented the entire Serbian nation. But the activities of the Serbian Patriarchs were not confined to the boundaries of the Turkish Empire. In those days they extended far beyond those frontiers. The Patriarchs appealed for aid and support for the Serbian people to Russia, Spain, Venice, and Austria, and thus became well-known

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. "Život Cara Uroša od Patrijarha Pajseja" ("Life of Tsar Uroš by Patriarch Pajsej").

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 441.

[3] Ibid., No. 683.

[4] Ibid., No. 1534.

figures in international politics. Everywhere the Courts and Governments of foreign States recognized the Serbian Patriarchs as the heads of the Serbian people. Russian Tsars corresponded with them; when Spain was at war with Turkey it was to the Serbian Patriarch to whom she had to apply when she desired help from the Serbs; Austrian Emperors wrote to the Serbian Patriarchs, negotiated with them, and granted them privileges for the whole Serbian nation. In all these activities of the Serbian Patriarchs the Macedonians were inseparably united with the rest of the Serbs. But it is in connection with the dealings of the Patriarchs with Russia and Austria that the Serbian character of Macedonia comes out most clearly.

The lot of the Serbian people under the Turks was always hard in the extreme. Exorbitant taxes, confiscations of property, the persecution and devastation of entire counties were the order of the day. Distress and poverty pressed hard upon the Serbs from all sides. "O poor, poor are we because of the Turks in these days," laments a Serbian monk of the Monastery of Lesnovo in Macedonia in an annotation.[1] With great difficulty the impoverished and reduced Serbian population succeeded in repairing its churches and monasteries and supplying them with the bare necessities. This caused the Serbian Patriarchs to think of applying for help to their Russian brothers in race and religion. With the blessing and recommendation of the Patriarch, Serbian missions travelled to Orthodox Russia and returned thence with abundant gifts. In this matter, too, Macedonia formed no exception. From Macedonia,

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 2922.

as from other Serbian lands, missions went to Russia to collect alms and donations for their churches and monasteries.

In this contact with Russia, the Serbian character of Macedonia comes out quite clearly. All Macedonian missions to Russia describe themselves simply as *Serbian*. The first of these missions from Macedonia travelled to Russia in 1585. It consisted of the Metropolitan of Kratovo, Visarion, accompanied by a monk of the Monastery of Osogovo and a monk in holy orders. The object of their journey was to solicit donations for the restoration of the Monastery of Osogovo, "which had been built aforetime by the great *Serbian* Vojvode Constantine Dejanović."[1] In 1641, the Metropolitan Simeon of Skoplje travelled to Russia to collect donations, and there recorded his signature as "Simeon, Metropolitan, of the land of Serbia."[2] In 1666, Ananiji, Metropolitan of Kratovo, addressed a petition to the Russian Tsar to help the Monastery of Lesnovo, "which had been built by the late and deceased Tsar Stephan, who was formerly a Tsar in the land of Serbia."[3] In 1687 a petition was presented to the Russian Tsars Ivan and Peter Alexievitch by "Jeftimije, by the grace of God Orthodox Metropolitan of the Serbian lands of the Church of Skoplje," soliciting help for the Metropolitans of Skoplje.[4] In 1688 there came to Russia certain monks "from the land of Serbia," who hailed from the Monastery of St. John Preteča near Skoplje.[5]

[1] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. pp. 222–224.

[2] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxxviii. p. 60; "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. p. 228.

[3] "Glas," vol. lviii. p. 261; "Spomenik," vol. xxxviii. p. 66.

[4] "Spomenik," vol. xxxviii. p. 71.

[5] "Glas," vol. lx. p. 156.

We need not assume that these missions described themselves as Serbian merely because they came from territories under the Serbian Patriarchal See. On the contrary, they did so because it was at that time unquestionably received that Macedonia was a Serbian country. The mission which came from territories lying outside the Serbian Patriarchate, e.g. from the territory belonging to the Archbishopric of Ochrida, described themselves similarly. There, too, the Serbians suffered the same hardships as those who were under the Serbian Patriarchate. Thence, too, missions travelled to Russia to ask for help, and they, too, described themselves as *Serbian*. In 1625, Sergius, Metropolitan of Greben in the southernmost part of Macedonia, went to Russia for the purpose of collecting alms. There he stated that "he had been consecrated Metropolitan of Greben by Nektarije, Archbishop of Ochrida in the land of *Serbia*."[1] In 1628 Bishop Kalinik travelled to Russia. He stated that he came "from the country of Salonica, *which is in Serbia*."[2] In 1634, Archbishop Avram of Ochrida went to Russia with his suite. On being asked who they were, they replied that "they were of the Orthodox faith, from the *Serbian country*, from the town of Ochrida."[3] In 1643 the Archimandrite of the Monastery of Kremenec, German, during his stay in Russia, described himself as being "from the *Serbian country*, from the town of Kostur."[4] In 1648 we find

[1] "Snošenija Rosiji s vostokom po djelam cerkovnim," ii. Petrograd, 1860, p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 62.

[3] V. Djerić, "O Srpskom Imenu u Starvj Srbiji i Makedoniji" ("The term 'Serbian' in Old Serbia and Macedonia"), Belgrade, 1904, p. 18.

[4] "Snošenja Rosiji s vostokom," p. 238.

the "*Serb* Dimitrije Nikolajev," from Kostur,[1] in Russia. In 1704 "the *Serb* Bratan Jvanov "came to Russia" from the land of Macedonia."[2] In 1706 a certain Dimitrije Petrov went to Russia for the purpose of collecting contributions for the completion of the Church of St. Dimitrije; he subscribed himself as "from the *country of Serbia*, for the eparchy of Ochrida," of the town of Krčava. A Russian document concerning this Dimitrije states that upon his departure "*for the land of Serbia*" the "*Serb* Dimitrije Petrov" was presented with a gift.[3]

Owing to their unhappy lot under the Turks, the Serbian people continued to emigrate. From Macedonia, too, numerous Serbs fled to foreign parts. No matter whither they went they invariably described themselves as Serbs. And this is valuable additional testimony to the Serbian nationality of the Macedonians. In 1580 we find in Krajova in Roumania, the "protopop (Archpresbyter) John, a *Serb* of Kratovo," as he styles himself in an MS. from his hand.[4] Because of the Turkish persecutions, which had become intolerable, Simeon, Metropolitan of Skoplje, went to Russia in 1641 to settle there permanently. He says of himself, that he is "from the *country of Serbia*, from the town of Skoplje." With him were a monk in holy orders and three servants.[5] In 1651, the Metropolitan Michael of Kratovo, accompanied by the Archimandrite Dionisij and the deacons Damaskin and Nikodim, fled

[1] V. Djerić, "O Srpskom Imenu," p. 27.
[2] Ibid., p. 27.
[3] Ibid., p. 23.
[4] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 752.
[5] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. p. 229.

to Russia because of Turkish persecutions. In a letter to the Russian Tsar the Metropolitan Michael states that "his fathers and his forefathers were princes in the *land of Serbia*, in the town of Kratovo."[1] In 1687 "the Venerable Jeftimije, by the grace of God Orthodox Metropolitan of the *Serbian* lands of the Church of Kratovo," came to Russia with the purpose of settling there as his metropolitanate was in a sad plight, and the outrages of the Turks had become intolerable. He was accompanied by Antinogen, a monk in holy orders, the deacon Antonije, and an old man, Marko.[2] In 1688 the monk in holy orders, Petronije, and the deacon Joseph travelled "*from the land of Serbia*," from the Monastery of St. John Preteča near Skoplje, to Russia to settle there, because their monastery had been destroyed by the Turkish soldiery.[3]

Although these Macedonian emigrants lived far from their native land, they never forgot that they were Serbs. Everywhere they worked zealously for the benefit of their people, and their Church in Macedonia and elsewhere. While living as an emigrant in Russia, "Michael, Metropolitan of Banja, Kratovo, and Ištip," in 1653 despatched thence copies of the sacred writings to the Serbian Patriarchate at Ipek. In a psalter which has been preserved, the Metropolitan Michael wrote with his own hand that he "sends it to the Serbian Patriarchate at Ipek, where rest the bones of the Holy Fathers Arsenij, Evstatij, and Nikodim, aforetime

[1] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. p. 233. The signature of this Metropolitan used to run "Metropolitan of Banja, Kratovo, Ištip and Radonir" (Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 1494, 1547).

[2] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lx. p. 155.

[3] Ibid., p. 156.

Serbian Patriarchs."[1] In 1660 that same Metropolitan Michael petitioned the Russian Tsar for aid for the "Serbian Monastery of Lesnovo" in Macedonia, "which was a foundation of the *Serbian* Tsar Stephan."[2] Such of the Serbian population as remained in their own country looked upon the Serbian emigrants as their natural representatives and ambassadors abroad. The former therefore appealed to the latter on every occasion for help and intervention. In 1653 the monks of the Serbian monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos applied to the Metropolitan Michael for his intervention so that their monastery might receive subsidies.[3]

But apart from these individual emigrants, the wholesale emigrations of Macedonians equally bear a purely Serbian character. The main current of the stream of Serbian emigration *en masse* continued to set northwards, as before, to the lands under Austria. There Serbian emigrants had lived in large numbers ever since the Turkish invasion. There, too, we find the emigrants from Macedonia. At this epoch the emigrations *en masse* were largely connected with the political activities of the Patriarchs. Seeing that in obedience to the call of their Patriarchs the Serbs had risen in revolt and joined a foreign nation in fighting against the Turks, the Serbian people, thus compromised, dared not remain any longer under the Turks, but were compelled to fly. In Budapest, in Komoran, and all other Hungarian towns we now find emigrants from Macedonia. In 1667 the Austrian Emperor Leopold I granted certain

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi," ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 1500.

[2] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxxviii. p. 64.

[3] Ibid., p. 62.

privileges to the *Serbs* and Greeks who settled in Upper Hungary, and who were mostly natives of Macedonia ("præsertim autem ex Macedonia advenientium").[1]

The greatest of these Serbian migrations to Austria took place in 1690. It affords a specially striking proof of the political power and authority of the Serbian Patriarchs.

After their failure before Vienna in 1683 the Turks began to be thrust back towards the south. In the hearts of the Serbian people the Austrian successes aroused the hope of liberation from the Turks. After the Turkish defeat at Mohacs in 1687, the Serbs rebelled in earnest with a view to regaining their liberty. At that time the Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević was head of the Serbian Church. Wishing to take advantage of the dissatisfaction of the Serbs with their Turkish masters, Austria negotiated with him, and promised to help him in the liberation of the Serbian people from the Turks. At the call of their Patriarch the people rose in arms against the Turks and helped the Austrian forces to penetrate into the very heart of the Serbian lands. The Turks, however, succeeded in beating back the Austrians in 1690. The Patriarch, the leading insurgents, and a multitude of the Serbian people —over 40,000 families—dared not wait for the advancing Turks, but joined the Austrian army in its retreat. The Turks reconquered all Serbia as far as the Save and the Danube, and the Serbian refugees were compelled to remain in Austria. By special charters, issued to the Serbian Patriarch, the Austrian Emperor Leopold I guaranteed political and religious rights to these emigrant Serbs.

[1] See document in "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. lxvii. pp. 128, 131.

This "Great Migration," as it is called in Serbian history, had a far-reaching effect upon the Serbian people. Whole provinces in Bosnia, Hercegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, and Macedonia, "even to Salonica,"[1] were depopulated. To this dáy popular tradition in Macedonia remembers the pitiful depopulation of entire villages at that time.[2] In the town of Buda alone there were at that time to be found emigrants from all over Macedonia. There were Ćira Krajić of Skoplje; Stojan Josipović from Prilep; Veljko Popović and the monk in holy orders, Grigorije, from Kratovo; Dima Apostolović; Danilo and Kuzman Dimić from Salonica; Isak Bojković (native place unknown), etc.[3]

In Austria all these emigrants, no matter whence they came, felt themselves to be parts of one and the same nation. The Macedonians were not kept apart as being different, but on the contrary often distinguished themselves as leaders and representatives of all the Serbs. When in October 1689 the Austrians, for political reasons, imprisoned George Branković, the leader of the Serbian nation, all the Serbs in Austria elected in his place as their lieutenant ("vice-ductor nationis Serbicæ") one Jovan *Manastirlija*, a Macedonian from Bitolj. He was confirmed in his dignity on April 11, 1691,[4] by the

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 2015.

[2] "Srpska Kraljevska Akademija"—"Naselja Srpskih Zemalja" ("Settlements of Serbian Lands"), vol. iii. p. 458.

[3] G. Vitković, "Spomenici iz budimskog i peštanskog arhiva" ("Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva"), series 2, vol. iii. pp. 228–255. Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 2296.

[4] "Nos electum a mentionata communitate Rasciana vice directorem Joannem Manasterly ad demissam eiusdem gentis instantion benigne confirmasse . . ." ("Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. lxvii. p. 140).

Emperor Leopold I. On being appointed head of the Serbian nation, Jovan Manastirlija led the Serbs against the Turks; the fate of the nation was in his hands, and he left a glorious memory behind him. The descendants of John Manastirlija played a distinguished part among the Serbs in Austria. Several of them were buried in Serbian monasteries, in token of the high respect they had enjoyed during their lives.[1] Other important positions among the Serbs in Austria were also at one time and another held by Macedonians. In 1696 Jefrem Janković-Tetovac[2] (of Tetovo) was Serbian bishop of the eparchy of Mohacs. Finally, some of the descendants of these Macedonian emigrants among the Serbs attained the highest distinction from an intellectual point of view. The ancestors of Branko Radičević, the founder of Serbian modern poetry, came originally from the neighbourhood of Skoplje.

Serbian literary records of those days speak of Macedonia as a Serbian country. The Serbian Patriarch Pajsej, writing during the first half of the seventeenth century, says in his life of Tsar Uroš, that the Turks, after taking Adrianople, "tried to enter the *Serbian land* (Macedonia)," and that "they were opposed by Uglješa and Vukašin with the *Serbian* (Macedonia) forces."[3] A MS. has been preserved to us containing the entry dating from 1625 which mentions that the Metropolitan Sergije of Greben was ordained to this dignity by Nektarije,

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 2968, 3343, 5287.

[2] D. Ruvarac, "Vladika Jegarski Jefrem Banjanin" ("Jefrem Banjanin, Bishop of Jegar"), Sremski, Karlovici, 1904, p. 20.

[3] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. p. 222.

Archbishop of Ochrida in the *land of Serbia*.[1] In 1624 the Metropolitan Michael of Kratovo travelled from Russia to Jerusalem. He relates how by traversing Poland, Roumania, and the *Serbian land*, he reached Mount Athos. Likewise, he says, that on his return he went by Mount Athos, through "*Serbian country*," Roumania, and Poland, and thus back to Russia. The "Serbian land" lying close to Mount Athos could only be Macedonia. From an entry in a book preserved in the Troicko-Sergievskaya Lavra, near Moscow, and dating from 1659, we learn that in that year that same Metropolitan Michael "of the *Serbian land*," of the town of Kratovo, performed the usual rites in connection with the ordination of certain priests and deacons. After residing for many years in Russia, this Metropolitan Michael finally declared that he desired to return "to his *Serbian country*," to his Monastery of Lesnovo.[2] In 1682 the Serbian Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević went to Jerusalem. On his way through Macedonia (Skoplje, Mlado Nagoričino, Palanka, Dupnica, and Samokov) he was everywhere joyfully received by the bishops, priest, and people. Many joined him and accompanied him. In his diary the Patriarch specially mentions that in the village of Sestrima, a day's walk from Samokov towards Tatar-Pažardžik, "Master Raja, a *Serbian*, made a great banquet in his house, to which he invited all the Hadžis and feasted them." The only Bulgars mentioned by the

[1] "Snošenija Rosiji s vostokom po djelam cerkovnim," ii. 1680, p. 29.

[2] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. lviii. pp. 233, 254, 258, 259. Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), Nos. 1563, 1568.

Patriarch are those of Tatar-Pažardžik; he was not their guest, but the Bulgarian merchants vied with each other as to who should sell him goods at the highest price.[1] An entry, dating from the end of the seventeenth century, relates how in 1683 the Austrians took "the *Serbian country* as far as Skoplje and Sofia" from the Turks.[2] A chronicle of 1712 enumerates the Orthodox Metropolitans in the "*land of Serbia.*" Among them are included the Metropolitans of Skoplje and Kratovo.[3] In 1778 a monk of the Monastery of Hilendar copied a history of Skander Bey (George Kastriot Skanderbeg) from an old MS. In this history Macedonian is in many passages spoken of as the "*Serbian country,*" and its inhabitants as *Serbs.* This history also contains the statement that in the towns of Debar and Sveti Grad live "*Serbs*" of the Orthodox faith, and Latins and Albanians of the Catholic faith."[4] An eighteenth-century chronicle says that in the fourteenth century "there were three *Serbian kings*; to wit, in Prizren there was Lazar, in Bosnia there was Stephan Tortko, and in Prilep there was *Marko Vukašinov.*"[5]

Foreign records of those days likewise speak of Macedonia as being a Serbian country. On the map of the Italian Geographer Giac. Gastaldi, dating from 1566, Serbia includes Skoplje and the surrounding country. On many maps by V. Coronelli, official

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxxiii. pp. 187–188.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 5304.

[3] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. iii. p. 108.

[4] "Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxii. pp. 15–18.

[5] S. Ristić, "Dečanski Spomenici" ("Dečani Records"), Belgrade, 1864, p. 7.

geographer to the Republic of Venice, and dating from 1692, Serbia is shown as extending even beyond Skoplje. Besides Skoplje we practically always find the legend "Capital of Serbia" (Metropoli della Servia). On many seventeenth-century maps drawn by "the Royal Geographer" Serbia is shown as including even the whole of the country surrounding Skoplje. These are also the frontiers assigned to Serbia on the maps of F. de Witt and of Blau, and in H. Moll's atlas as well as on many other maps of the second half of the seventeenth century. On numerous maps in the well-known atlases by Joh. Bapt. Homann's, dating from the first half of the eighteenth century, Serbia includes the regions of Skoplje, Kratovo, and Ćustendil. Thus it is also shown on many other maps.[1]

More clearly than from these maps the Serbian character of Macedonia transpires from certain MSS. and other books in foreign languages. A Roumanian MS. of the beginning of the seventeenth century, in describing the battle of the Marica says incidentally that "Sultan Murat went with the Turks against Uglješa and Vukašin, and that they assembled a great *army of Serbs* (in Macedonia) and accepted battle. . . ."[2] The Russian Tsars, when granting subsidies to the Serbian churches and monasteries in Macedonia, invariably call them *Serbian*, and speak of Macedonia as the *Serbian land*. When on August 1st, 1641, the Russian Tsar, Michael Feodorovitch,

[1] J. Cvijić, "Geografski Položaj Makedonije i Stare Srbije"—"Geographical Conditions of Macedonia and Old Serbia" ("Srpski Knjizevin Glasnik"), vol. xi. 1904, p. 209.

[2] V. Grigorovič, "O Serbiji v jeja ôtnosenijah k sosednim deržavam," p. 17.

made a donation to the Serbian Patriarchate through the Metropolitan of Skoplje, he addressed the latter as Metropolitan of "the *Serbian land* of the town of Skoplje."[1] It is recorded in the annals of the Russian Court that in the year 1652 the "Serbian Metropolitan Michael," of Kratovo, twice dined with the Tsar.[2] In an Imperial letter to the Monastery of Lesnovo, dated October 31, 1660, the Russian Tsar Aleksije Mihailović speaks of the Metropolitan of Kratovo as "the Metropolitan Michael of the *Serbian land.*"[3] The Russian Tsaritsa Elizabeth in her letters invariably refers to Macedonia as a "*Serbian country.*" In her messages of 1744, 1754, 1758, and 1766 she addresses herself to the "noble and honourable gentlemen of the Serbian countries of Macedonia, Skanderia (Albania), Montenegro, the Maritime Region. . . ."[4] Writing about Serbia in 1685, the Catholic bishop of Skoplje speaks of Skoplje as "the *Capital of Serbia*", ("Scopia . . . metropoli de Servia"). After this he proceeds to mention Catholic, Mohammedan and Orthodox households in that city. Among the Orthodox he mentions only "*Greek and Serbian households*" ("case greche e serviane").[5] Finally we have the testimony of the Bulgarian, Peter Bogdani-Bakšić, a native of Ćiprova in Bulgaria, the Catholic Bishop of Sofia, who wrote to some Cardinal in 1650 about

[1] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxxvii. p. 60.

[2] J. Sreznevski, "Filologičeskija nabljudenija A. H. Vostokova," 1865, p. 184.

[3] "Spomenik," vol. xxxvii. p. 65.

[4] S. Milutinović, "Istorija Crne Gore" ("History of Montenegro"), 1835, pp. 76, 77, 83, 85.

[5] A. Theiner, "Vetera monumenta Slavorum Meridionalium," ii, 1875, p. 220.

his cousin Andreas Bagdani to recommend him for the appointment of Catholic Archbishop of Ochrida. He says that his cousin "has been nominated for the archiepiscopate of Ochrida up in Serbia" ("proposto per l'archivescovato d'Ocrida su in confini della Servia").[1]

While the power of the Serbian Patriarchate endured, the Serbian character of Macedonia was not in any way overthrown or impaired.

In 1766 the Turks once more suppressed the Serbian Patriarchate and its territories were placed under the administration of the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople. The suppression of the Patriarchate was a terrible blow to the Serbian nation. The Serbian bishops were stripped of their dignities, they were expelled or went voluntarily into exile. Greek bishops were appointed in their places. The Serbian nation was left without a head, Serbian civilization lost its protector, and in the Christian churches divine service was conducted in Greek. This misfortune also fell heavily upon that part of the Serbian nation which lived outside the Turkish Empire. Sava Petrović, Metropolitan of Montenegro, as representative of the free part of the Serbian nation, protested to Russia, and besought that this crime against the Serbs in Turkey should find redress. In a letter written on February 26th, 1767, to the Metropolitan Platon of Moscow, he speaks "of the *Serbian nation* under the harsh and intolerable yoke of Turkish slavery," and of the Serbian bishops of "*Samokov*, *Skoplje*, *Ištip*, Novi Pazar, Niš, Užice, Belgrade and Hercegovina," all of whom "are expelled and deprived of their Sees, and are homeless

[1] "Starine Jugoslovenske Akademije," vol. xxv. p. 172.

wanderers . . . , while others are exiled to strange parts, and not one eparchy has *its native bishop, a Serbian*. . . . Greeks have been brought thither in their stead. . . ." Hereupon he begs that "the deposed Serbian bishops be reinstated," and "the throne of the Serbian Patriarchate of Ipek freed from the Greeks," to "the joy of all Serbian Bishops and the whole *Serbian nation*." [1]

Even in this epilogue to the history of the Serbian Patriarchate, the Montenegrin Metropolitan draws no distinction between the Serbian dioceses in Macedonia and the rest of the Serbian dioceses. All are alike Serbian to him, and for all of them he begs for "their native *Serbian* Bishops."

[1] "Glasnik Srpškop Ucenog Društva," vol. xii. pp. 357–359.

VIII

MACEDONIA AND THE SERBIAN STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION

Serbian sentiment of the Macedonians after the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Sad plight of Macedonia after the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate—Serbian sympathy for Macedonia — Macedonian aspirations to emancipate Serbian nation from the Turks—Participation of Macedonians in Austro-Turkish War (1788–1791) for liberation of the Serbs from the Turks—Participation of Macedonians in the Serbian insurrection under Karageorge and Miloš Obrenović at the beginning of the nineteenth century—Moral support for Serbia from Macedonia—Macedonian national poetry celebrates the struggle of the Serbian nation against the Turks

THE feeling of unity between the Macedonians and the rest of the Serbian nation did not become extinct even after the fall of the Serbian Patriarchate.

All Serbs outside Macedonia continued to regard Macedonia as belonging to them. Macedonia was then in a wretched plight. Left to the mercy of the Greek bishops, she had lost all her schools. The churches and monasteries were in Greek hands or else deserted. The Slav liturgy had practically become extinct. The Serbian monks in those monasteries where the Greek influence was less felt regarded it as their duty to the nation at such a time to do all they could to elevate Serbian education and religion in Macedonia. In 1780, the monk Teofil of the Monastery of Dečani, went to the Monastery of the Holy Archangel in the Skopska Crna Gora (Black

Mountain). There he opened a school, taught the young men to read and write, and prepared candidates for the priesthood.[1] In 1805, Teodosije, a monk in holy orders of the Monastery of Dečani went to the deserted Monastery of Lesnovo in Macedonia; with the help of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood he repaired it, and reintroduced the forgotten Slav liturgy within its walls.[2] In the same year we find the "monk in holy orders Mojseg Dečanac" in Tetovo.[3]

But the Serbian lay population did not make any difference either. Writing to the Emperor of Russia in 1789, the Montenegrin governor Ivan Radonjić begins his letter as follows: "Now all we Serbs of Montenegro, Hercegovina . . . Albania, Macedonia . . . beg of . . ."[4]

But more strongly than by any fraternal sympathy did the Macedonians express their Serbian feeling in later days; they expressed it most positively and by the greatest sacrifices, and they did this by the share they bore in the struggle which the Serbian nation waged for liberation from the Turks. The focus of that struggle could not be in Macedonia. Not on any of her frontiers was Macedonia sufficiently near to a foreign State whence she could be supplied with the necessaries of war. The Serbian struggle for liberation began in regions remote from her, where the support of free Europe was accessible. Yet from the first the fight against the Turks was understood as the common

[1] S. Tomić, "Naselja Srpskih Zemalja" ("Settlement of the Serbian Lands"), vol. iii. p. 509.

[2] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 3822.

[3] Ibid., No. 3828.

[4] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. lxxii. p. 297.

action of the whole Serbian nation, as the germ of future freedom. Serbs from all the Serbian lands took part in the struggle. The Macedonians bore their share with the rest.

Already, in those battles which, at the call of the Serbian Patriarch, the Serbian people fought at the the close of the seventeenth century, we have seen Macedonians fighting by the side of their brothers. Defeated together with the other Serbs they fled in large numbers to Austria, and there, as we have seen, strengthened the ranks of the Serbian emigrants. In the renewed struggle against the Turks the part played by the Macedonians was even greater.

When in 1788 Austria went to war with Turkey, she called also upon the Serbs for assistance. As recompense for their help, Austria promised them liberation from the Turks and a happier future. Desirous of freedom, great hosts of Serbs enrolled themselves as volunteers under the Austrian flag. The more notable of these volunteers were commissioned as officers by the Austrians and placed at the head of the Serbian volunteers. The list of these officers, taken mainly from the archives in Vienna, shows to what extent, in proportion, many Serbian provinces were represented.

Of the Serbian leaders commissioned by Austria, 16 had come from Serbia, 2 from Bosnia, 9 from Croatia, 38 from Srem and Slavonia, 1 from the Bačka, 1 from the Banat, 1 from Old Serbia, and 9 from Macedonia. Of these last there were commissioned as Captains: Vlajko Stojanović, of Leunovo (district of Tetovo); Deli Djordje Nikolajević, of Bele Vode (Prilep district); Petar Novaković-Čardaklija, of Leunovo; Kuzman Čikić, of Mavrovo. Commissioned as Lieutenants: Miloš

Krajević, of Mavrovo; Jovan Nikolajević-Čardoklija, of Leunovo. Commissioned as Sub-lieutenants: Trifun Tenasević, of Debar; Vučko Čikić, of Mavrovo: Trifun Trpković, of Debar.[1]

These men who fought for the freedom of the Serbian nation at the end of the eighteenth century are the best proof of the Serbian sentiment in Macedonia at that time.

The Serbian sentiment of the Macedonians is likewise clearly shown by their taking part in the fights against the Turks which broke out in Serbian territory at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The two Serbian insurrections against the Turks at the beginning of the nineteenth century were decisive events in the history of the Serbian nation. The Serbs regarded them as a resurrection, as the opening-up of a new, free, national period of Serbian history. Therefore, there was no part of all the Serbian lands which did not hasten to place its services at the disposal of the Serbian insurgents and resuscitated Serbia. From the last and least herd-boy to the most distinguished—the writers, poets, philosophers of the nation—they all stood by the Serbian insurgents. Some joined the ranks of the fighting men; others gave their moral support.

Here, also, we find Macedonians. They, too, helped with all their might. Many heroes from Macedonia have set their mark upon the history of the Serbian insurrection against the Turks. We will mention only the most important among them.

[1] Drag. M. Pavlović: "Srbija za vreme poslednjeg austro-turskog rata" ("Serbia during the last Austro-Turkish War, 1788–1791"), p. 143, Belgrade, 1910. Lazar Arsenijević-Batalaka, "Istorija srpskog ustanka" ("History of the Serbian Insurrection"), i. p. 141, Belgrade, 1899.

Vučko Čikić, of Mavrovo. Served as officer in the Austro-Turkish War. After the war, he would not return to his native country, which was under Turkish rule, but settled in Srem, where he was in receipt of a pension from Austria. When the Serbian insurrection broke out in 1804, he at once sacrificed his pension and comfortable existence, went to Serbia and joined the ranks of the combatants. While in command of an army which was resisting the Turkish pressure from the south, he constructed the well-known Serbian fortress of Deligrad. While defending Deligrad Čikić died gloriously on April 3rd, in 1808. He was buried in the old Serbian Monastery of St. Roman, near Deligrad.[1]

Kusman Čikič, brother of Vučko Čikić, also of Mavrovo, succeeded him in the command of Deligrad. He was an Austrian volunteer officer. He also settled in Srem and enjoyed an Austrian pension. He also gave up everything and accompanied his brother to Serbia. He also fought heroically for Serbia's independence from the Turks.[2]

Janko Popovic, of Ochrid. He went to Serbia before the insurrection. A bitter enemy of the Turks, he agitated against them even before the insurrection. No sooner had the insurrection broken out, than he joined the ranks of the combatants. Owing to the gallant way in which he distinguished himself in battle, he became a leader (*vojvoda*) and is one of the most notable figures in the Serbian insurrection. His courage and ability were specially in evidence in the battles of

[1] M. Dj. Milićević, "Pomenik znamenitih ljudi u srpskom narodu" ("Reminiscences of Famous Men of the Serbian Nation"), p. 168.

[2] L. Arsenijević-Batalaka, "Istorija Srpskog Ustanka" ("History of the Serbian Insurrection"), i. pp. 4, 5, 59, 141.

Mišar, Belgrade, and Bijeljina. He died in 1833, and was buried at Ravanica, one of the most important of the Serbian monasteries of the Middle Ages.[1]

Marko Krstić, of Belica. He also went to Serbia before the insurrection. As soon as the insurrection broke out he joined the ranks of the combatants. He was under the direct command of Kara George. As he distinguished himself in every battle, Kara George took note of him, and he soon became an independent *vojvoda* (leader). He was one of the most important army leaders in the second insurrection under Miloš Obrenović, in 1815. Through exposing himself, he was severely wounded in the second insurrection. He died at Šabac in 1822.[2]

Djordje Zagla, of Blace. He went to Serbia with three of his brothers after the outbreak of the insurrection, and immediately joined the fighting-men. He soon became the chief military leader in Smederevo under the command of Vujica Vulićević, was distinguished for his gallantry and an enthusiastic fighter. He was wounded frequently, several times seriously. He died in Belgrade in 1847.[3]

Vreta Kolarac, of Macedonia (his native place is not exactly known). Conspicuous for his bravery as a volunteer, he became an army leader in the Kara George insurrection. He distinguished himself especially at Mačva in 1806.[4]

Mica Brka, of Mavrovo, son of Milos Krajević. Lieutenant of Volunteers in the Austro-Turkish war. He fought bravely in every battle in the Kara George insurrection, and finally found a hero's death on the

[1] M. Dj. Milićević, "Pomenik" ("Reminiscences"), pp. 196–197.
[2] Ibid., pp. 796–799. [3] Ibid., pp. 169–170. [4] Ibid., pp. 60–61.

battlefield in 1813, together with Hajduk-Veljko, the greatest hero of New Serbian history.[1]

Besides those distinguished Macedonians who, as leaders of the Serbian insurgents, opened up an epoch of liberty in modern Serbian history, there was also a host of heroes of the rank and file from Macedonia, who with their blood and self-sacrifice helped to create a free Serbia.

But in joining the Serbian insurrection, the Macedonians offered not only their blood. There were numerous Macedonians who helped morally in the liberation and the strengthening of Serbia, and of these, too, we will mention the most distinguished.

Petar Ičko, born in Katranica. Upon the outbreak of the insurrection under Kora George, he proceeded to Serbia. Being an able and intelligent man, he was employed on various missions. He was also entrusted with the negotiations with the Turks. The peace which the Serbian insurgents concluded with the Turks in 1806 was concluded through his mediation, and to this day it is called *Ičkov Mir* (Ichko's Peace). He was buried in the Monastery of Rakovica, near Belgrade.[2]

Petar Novaković-Čardaklija, born in Leunovo. He held a captain's commission in the Austro-Turkish war. After the war he enjoyed a pension from Austria. When the tidings of the insurrection reached him, he at once sacrificed his pension. Being a man of ability and experience, he was entrusted with various missions on behalf of the Serbian insurgents—the first time in Petrograd in 1804 and subsequently in Constantinople in 1805; also to the Russian General Staff in 1807. When the

[1] L. Arsenijević-Batalaka, "Istorija srpskoga ustanka" ("History of the Serbian Insurrection"), i. p. 59.

[2] M. Dj. Milićević, "Pomenik" ("Reminiscences"), pp. 186–189.

"Praviteljstvujušči Sovjet Srbski" (the first Government of Free Serbia) was established in 1805, he was one of the members. He died in 1810.[1]

Jovan Novaković-Čardaklija, the brother of Petar Navakovič-Cardaklija, also born in Leunovo. He held a lieutenant's commission in the Austro-Turkish war, and subsequently enjoyed an Austrian pension. He also sacrificed his Austrian pension and, together with his brother, crossed the Serbian frontier. He also was entrusted with various services which the insurgents required from this able and distinguished patriot.[2]

Dimitrije Djordjević, of Macedonia—his birthplace is not exactly known. He served under Milan Obrenović in the insurrection led by Kara George. In the insurrection under Miloš Obrenović he fulfilled various dúties as interpreter, clerk, treasurer, Governor of Jagodina District, and envoy in diplomatic missions to Constantinople. From every point of view he was an upright man and a great patriot. For the services he had rendered to renewed Serbia, Prince Miloš decreed that the names of Dimitrije Djordjević and his wife were to be mentioned in divine service in church in the same way as those of Prince Miloš and his brothers. He died in Jagodin in 1836. The inscription on his tomb says that "He was a man who deserved greatly of his Serbian fatherland.[3]

Dositije Novaković, born in the village of Dabica, near Prilep. He was a monk. As he could not endure the Turkish horrors, he fled to newly liberated Serbia under Miloš Obrenović and laboured actively for her extension towards the east. When Serbia was enlarged, he

[1] L. Arsenijević-Batalaka, "Istorija srpskog ustanka" ("History of the Serbian Insurrection"), i. pp. 141, 147, 161, 183, 242, etc.
[2] Ibid. [3] M. Dj. Milićević, "Reminiscences," pp. 151–153.

became the first bishop in the new territories in 1834. His kindness, generosity, and wise instruction to his people endeared his memory to them. He died in 1854. His last wish was that he might not be buried in the church, as is usual for a bishop, but in the cemetery. "I have lived with my people, and it is with them that I wish to be in the churchyard; let the young grass grow on my grave." The grateful Serbian nation fulfilled the wish of its patriotic bishop.[1]

It was in this manner that the Macedonians expressed their Serbian sentiments during the Serbian insurrection for liberation at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

But this is not all. The whole of Macedonia has with its soul taken part in the Serbian struggle for liberation. While the men of Macedonia, shoulder to shoulder with the other Serbs were shedding their blood for Serbia, to whom they looked for the liberation of Macedonia also, the progress of the Serbian insurrection was followed with most ardent sympathy in every home in Macedonia inhabited by the plain people of the land. Everybody in Macedonia anxiously awaited the news from the battlefields; they took the keenest interest in every success, and composed ballads to celebrate the heroes of the Liberation of the Serbian people. Many songs have been composed in Macedonia in honour of the Serbian insurgents. The deeds of Kara George are celebrated in Macedonian ballads just the same as in ballads from other Serbian countries.[2] There is not a child in Macedonia who does not know the popular ballads of "Ilija Delija."[3] Ilija Delija is a well-known

[1] M. Dj. Milićević, "Reminiscences," pp. 446–448.

[2] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-slavjanski Sbornik" ("Macedonian Slav Collection"), i., St. Petersburg, No. 96 (Song from Prilep).

[3] Ibid., Nos. 101, 102, 103, 104.

hero of the Serbian insurrection. His real name was Ilija Strelja. He was born in Gradište, near Leskovac. After gathering together a large number of volunteers from his neighbourhood, he proceeded to Serbia. He distinguished himself specially at Deligrad in 1806. In 1809 he succeeded in invading his native district, whence he was intended to organize incursions and to raise all Macedonia against the Turks. Ilija Delija's ardent wish to free Macedonia from the Turks made him a favourite subject of Macedonian national poetry. Hajduk Veljko, the greatest hero of the insurrection under Kara George, even during his lifetime became a legendary hero and was celebrated in song; and also in Macedonia we find many songs in which Hajduk Veljko is honoured and celebrated, just as there are songs about him in other parts of Serbia.[1] In a popular ballad from Macedonia celebrating the insurrection under Miloš Obrenović, the Macedonians sing thus of the share they bore in it:—

"Enough have we gone, enough have we walked,
Enough have we walked on the plain of Šumadja (Serbia)
* * * * *
* * * * *
To destroy the great army,
To free our poor children."[2]

In order to deprecate criticism, we beg to state that we have quoted all Macedonian songs of the Serbian Insurrection against the Turks solely from the collections of Macedonian national songs and ballads made by Bulgarian collectors.

[1] Braća Miladinovci, "Bugarske Narodne Pesme" ("Bulgarian National Songs"), Nos. 215, 216, 217 (Songs from the Neighbourhood of Ochrid). P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-slavjanski Sbornik," i., No. 73 (Song from the Neighbourhood of Debra), No. 74 (Song from the Neighbourhood of Kostur), No. 75 (Song from Tetovo).

[2] St. I. Verković, "Narodne pesme Makedonskih Bugara" ("National Songs of the Macedonian Bulgars"), i., 1860, No. 353.

IX

BULGARIAN PROPAGANDA IN MACEDONIA

BULGARIAN RESURRECTION

Bulgars completely forgotten in Europe after the fall of the Bulgarian Empire in the Middle Ages—Bulgars in Bulgaria without national consciousness—Attempts at national awakening—The Ruthenian G. Venelin forms an idealistic picture of the Bulgars and rouses them—Bulgars, inspired by Venelin's fables, begin to dream of Great Bulgaria—The romantic enthusiast George S. Rakovski fosters Bulgarian megalomania—Stephan Verković and his forged Bulgarian antiquities—All Bulgars united in the conception of their unlimited greatness—Education of the rising generation in this spirit—Bulgarian ideas take hold in Russia—Committees for the propaganda of the Bulgarian idea in Russia—Russian scholars, infected by Bulgarism, become its pioneers—Sympathy for the Bulgars spreads from Russia to the rest of Europe

IF, in the nineteenth century, the Bulgars arose from the grave into which they were thrust by the Turks ever since the end of the fourteenth century, they are indebted for this entirely to the sentimental devotion of Slavophil Russia. Without this they would be ignorant to this day of their own existence as a nation. If during the course of the second half of the nineteenth century they attained emancipation from the Turks, they owe it to Russian blood and the humane sentiment of Europe. Without these they would have been slaves of the Turk to this day. But although they were resuscitated through the efforts of others, although their

emancipation was bought with the blood of others, the Bulgars were not content to let matters rest there. The psychology of a nation is not changed so easily. The old Bulgarian blood and the old insatiable and truculent Bulgarian spirit came out from the very first day of the renascence of the Bulgarian nation. The first New Bulgar dreamed already of becoming master over all his neighbours and much more besides. By servility, cunning and duplicity in their dealings with those who were stronger than themselves and able to help them; by a cleverly organized appeal to those who have anything to give; by an indefatigable propaganda for their imaginary rights, the Bulgars have succeeded in creating the fable of a greatness of the Bulgarian nation, its past and culture, of Bulgarian rights and interests beyond Bulgarian frontiers, and of Macedonia as a Bulgarian country. Herein alone lies the explanation why the Bulgars, a completely defunct nation, succeeded not only in obtaining their freedom and independence but also in finding advocates for their insatiable demands.

"After the fall of the Bulgarian Empire at the end of the fourteenth century, the Bulgars were completely forgotten in Europe. Even kindred Russia knew next to nothing about them. . . . They were forgotten to such an extent, that at the end of the eighteenth century and in the beginning of the nineteenth even the most well-informed and conscientious scholars had no clear knowledge of them. Thus, in 1771, Schlötzer hazarded the opinion that a study of the neo-Bulgarian language might throw light upon the nature of the Old Bulgars. Dobrovski, the patriarch of modern Slavistic, believed the Bulgarian language, of which he was entirely ignorant,

to be a dialect of Serbian. All that was known to Kopitar in 1815 was that in Bulgarian the article is placed *after* the noun. The earliest data concerning the Bulgarian language were furnished by the Serb Vuk. S. Karadžić in 1822 in his 'Dodatak Petrogradskim Uporednim Rečnicima' ('Supplement to the Petrograd Parallel Dictionaries'). All that Šafarik knew in 1826 was that the Bulgars live between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains and that there are 600,000 of them!". . . In these very words two distinguished Russian scholars express their total knowledge of the Bulgars at the beginning of the nineteenth century.[1]

Even the Bulgars themselves knew nothing about themselves. As the Bulgarian historian Drinov says, they had ceased to exist. Their one-time culture had not only disappeared, but was forgotten even by themselves. Educated Bulgarians—who could be counted on the fingers of one's hands—could not write their own language. The most notable Bulgarians were merchants, many of them were in business relations with Germany, Russia, and Africa; but not one of them knew a single letter of Bulgarian. They not only "carried on their correspondence in the neo-Greek or Roumanian languages, but they spoke only Greek and were proud of their Hellenism. The man who occasionally for his own convenience desired to make a note in Bulgarian as well, would write Bulgarian with Greek characters.[2]

Even towards 1830 the "intellectual" class contained

[1] A. N. Pipin and V. D. Spasovič, "Istorija Slavjanskih Literatur, 1879" ("History of Slav Literature"), p. 104 (in Russian).

[2] I. Venelin, "Zaradi Vozraždenije Novobolgarskoj Slovesnosti" ("Concerning the Renascence of Neo-Bulgarian Slavdom"), prevel (edited by) M. Kifilov, Bucharest, 1842, pp. 11, 34, 35, 50 (in Bulgarian); S. Milarov, V. E. Aprilov, Odessa, 1885, p. 5 (in Bulgarian).

"not a single Bulgar who would confess to being a Bulgar, or one who spoke Bulgarian or attended divine service in the Slav language. And after the fashion of all renegades they hated and despised all that was Bulgarian more than did the real Greeks." [1]

All Bulgarian attempts to emerge from this ignominious condition proved unavailing. The efforts of the Bulgarian monk Pajsije, who in 1762 tried to vindicate his nation by his "History of the Bulgarian Nation," remained unnoticed among the Bulgars themselves. His passionate reproaches to the Bulgars, because they read and write in Greek; because they forgot their nationality; because they yielded to Greek customs; because they insulted their native tongue; because they were ashamed of calling themselves Bulgars, clearly show how low the Bulgars had sunk. All attempts made at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the Bulgarian emigrants in Russia likewise remained unsuccessful. There were many Bulgarian emigrants in Russia, especially in the southern towns. Many of these were merchants of considerable wealth. Although every one of them had received a Greek education, yet there were some among them who contemplated a resurrection of their defunct nationality. But all in vain. The Bulgars were not able to raise themselves from their grave.

The Bulgarian renascence came from abroad. It was reserved for the youth Gjorgje Venelin, a Ruthenian (1802–1839), a native of Lemberg, to re-create the Bulgarian nation. After studying Slavistic at the

[1] E. Golubinski, "Kratki Očerk Istoriji Pravoslavnih Cerkvej" ("Short Outline of Orthodox Church History"), Moscow, 1871 pp. 176–177 (in Russian).

University of Lemberg, he proceeded to Russia. At Kišinjev he came across some Bulgarian emigrants who fired him with enthusiasm for the Bulgarian cause, and in 1829 he wrote a book in Russian entitled "Old and New Bulgars." Containing as it did something so far unknown, the book met with a favourable reception, and Venelin devoted himself with increased ardour to the cause of the Bulgars. In 1830 the Russian Academy commissioned him to explore Bulgaria. Thus he was afforded the opportunity of seeing the nation to which he had so lovingly devoted himself. Although he had considerable trouble with the objects of his affection, who threatened and blackmailed him—he was even robbed by a Bulgar of the "Carostavnik," a MS. of the Serbian Kings and Cars—and placed the most vexatious obstacles in his way, Venelin succeeded in collecting several old MSS., national ballads, and a certain amount of philological material. All this material was utilized by Venelin in his subsequent works on the Bulgars (description of his travels, the national ballads, Bulgarian literature, history and language). Although Venelin in his books furnished many details and created many assumptions regarding the Bulgars, his work does not possess great scientific value. Venelin was a great idealist, with a lively imagination. In his day the scientific material available on the subject of the Bulgars was both poor and scanty, and where his material failed him he supplied the deficiency from his exuberant imagination, "which in a few lines created pictures, so that he mistook for scientific results the ardent wish of his soul and the dream of his spirit." He himself admits that when he found his material deficient he supplemented it out of his own head. For

this reason "his books are full of mistakes, sometimes grave mistakes," and for this reason also "they very soon became obsolete." But if his works are of no scientific value, they are nevertheless of immense significance for the Bulgarian nation. "His great merit consists in the fact that he by himself created and resuscitated the Bulgarian nation, that he was responsible for the birth of the completely defunct Bulgarian nationality." [1]

The romantically fantastic Venelin appealed to the immature imagination of the Young Bulgars. He was hailed with love and enthusiasm, as a Messiah come to rescue a lost nation. All his observations, all his praises, all his suggestions were accepted like commands from heaven. He urged the wealthy Bulgars of Russia and Roumania to subscribe donations for the support of the Bulgarian cause, for the opening of Bulgarian schools, for the printing of school books.

Two Bulgarian merchants of Odessa, V. E. Aprilov and N. Palauzov, who had been completely Hellenized in their youth,[2] by reading Venelin became Bulgars and the first apostles of the Bulgarian awakening. Aprilov began to write books in Bulgarian, in which he speaks of his nation with fantastic enthusiasm. Palauzov conducted his propaganda by word of mouth and collected contributions. Both gave money for the opening of the school in Gabrovac, in 1835, the first of the Bulgarian schools. This work also influenced other Bulgars. The sum of donations contributed not only by Bulgars, but also by Russians and Roumanians

[1] Pipin and Spasovič, p. 112.

[2] Vasil Aprilov was treasurer of the Greek Insurgents' Committee in 1821.

constantly assumed greater proportions. Schools were opened, books published, young men sent to study in European schools and universities. Thus was inaugurated the first appearance of the Bulgars as a nation and the foundation of the idea of their deliverance from the Turks.

The whole of this movement took place within the limits of Bulgarian territory; of Macedonia the Bulgars had not even begun to dream. The movement was very popular, especially in Russia, who considered herself the protectress of the conquered Slavs, and in Serbia, who regarded the Bulgars as the broken nation of a brother-country. But the Bulgars were not content with this. In Venelin's books they found the stimulus towards a state of things which they had so far not even contemplated. Before visiting the Balkan Peninsula, Venelin wrote that the Bulgars were to be found not only in Bulgaria, but in Rumelia, Macedonia, Albania, Thessaly, South Morea, and Asia Minor as well;[1] that the Russians received Christianity from the Bulgars; that it was the Bulgars who brought them the use of the alphabet; that up to the time of Lomonosov, divine service had been celebrated in Russia in Bulgarian, which had also been the literary language, and that in ancient times not one of the other Slav nations had been so rich in MSS. and so forth.[2] The Bulgars were not slow in adopting even the most preposterous of Venelin's statements and magnifying them out of all sense and

[1] "Drevinje i Ninješnije Bolgare" ("Old and New Bulgars"), Moscow, 1829, vol. i. (in Russian).

[2] "Zaradi Vožrazdenije" ("Concerning the Renascence"), pp. 5, 17 (in Bulgarian).

proportion. For whereas Venelin was a good man with the soul of a poet, an idealist whose infatuation for the Bulgars carried him to absurd lengths—as he himself often admitted—the Bulgars grew restive under all criticism and went recklessly far beyond the limits which Venelin in his infatuation had assigned to the Bulgarian nation.

One of Venelin's first followers, the man who laid the foundation of the Bulgarian idea of expansion and of the *rôle* of the Bulgarian nation in the world, was the Bulgar Gjorgje S. Rakovski (1818–1868). In Venelin's fantastic ideas Rakovski found the inspiration for evolving a practical propaganda for the idea of the prehistoric claims of the Bulgars not only in the Balkan Peninsula, but far beyond it. Poet, historian, ethnographer, archæologist, publicist, social and ecclesiastical agitator, Rakovski wrote much on the subject of his nation. But his violent patriotism extinguished every glimmer of common sense and critical faculty in his writings. A few samples will suffice to show what Rakovski is. In his efforts to raise the Bulgarian nation, "high in the eyes of its own sons, and afterwards in those of the world,"[1] he has recourse to the realm of fairy tales, which is not the way of intelligent persons. He denies the ancient Greek sources, and places the Bulgars as precursors of the European nations; the Bulgarian language does not differ from the Sanscrit; Bulgarian national mythology is Indian,[2] even before the advent of Christianity the Bulgars could read and write and possessed a literature; Bulgaria was "at one time the chief of the Slav nations, the mightiest and most extensive

[1] Sofia paper *Mir*, February 8, 1917. [2] Pipin and Spasovič.

Empire in Europe in olden times;" "moral truth appeared among the Bulgars first of all the Slavs," "the most ancient relics of the old Slav customs and language have been preserved in various parts of Bulgaria and among the Bulgars of to-day." The Bulgars lived in the Balkan Peninsula before the Greek immigration; Demosthenes was a Bulgar; so was Marko Botsaris, a hero of the Greek insurrection;[1] all European languages and all European culture originated with the Bulgars. The ancient Peons and the Kelto-Kimbers were Bulgars; Clovis and Merovæus were Bulgars; the first Christian Church in Europe was founded among the Bulgars; they helped to establish the other churches, and they were the founders of Christian missionary activity; the Bulgars received Christianity earlier than the Greeks, "because they believed in one God, in the immortality of the soul, and in recompense after death"; the Greeks were converted later, because they were polytheists. Even the Olympic Zeus could not exist without the Bulgars. He was nursed and reared by the Bulgarian Mountain Villa (fay) Neda.[2]

It should specially be pointed out that Rakovski is not a "vulgar Bulgarian enthusiast." He is one of the most distinguished Bulgars of the nineteenth century. No one else looms so large in neo-Bulgarian political and literary history. The Sofia paper *Mir* of February 3, 1917, while calling upon the Bulgars to

[1] G. S. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik" ("A Traveller through the Mountains"), Novi Sad, 1857, pp. 164, 166, 175, 201, 231 (in Bulgarian).

[2] G. S. Rakovski, "Ključ Bolgarskoga Jazika" ("Key to the Bulgarian Language"), Odessa, 1880, pp. 109, 142–143, 94, etc. (in Bulgarian).

celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Rakovski's death, says that "the first half of the modern period of Bulgarian history is Rakovski's epoch," and proceeds to add that the question of the celebration "has already been taken up by the Bulgarian Academy of Science."

But Rakovski is by no means the only example we could quote. All Bulgarian patriots of the nineteenth century resembled him. There is one name, however, that we must mention, a name especially connected with Macedonia. It is that of Stephan I. Verković (1827–1893). As a schoolmaster in Macedonia, he is one of the most responsible, especially in Russia, for having paved the way for the mistaken idea that Macedonia is a Bulgarian country. He collected in Macedonia the local "Bulgarian" national ballads and wrote monographs upon them. Verković, too, can best be judged by quoting his work. Among other amazing troves he discovered in Macedonia the "Veda Slovenska," i.e. national poems of pre-historic antiquity! He collected hymns to Orpheus, the Thracian singer, and to the ancient Slav gods in Macedonia! He discovered ballads of Alexander the Great and the settlement of the Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula! He discovered what other less privileged mortals had overlooked, viz. that the "Bulgars" of Macedonia have preserved certain national songs or poems "referring to the primitive development of the human race," and the "mythology expressed in these traditions has a remarkable affinity with the Rig Veda," so that it occurred to him that "these poems must be, not only twin-sisters which grew from the same spring and source, but—what is more—that these poems of ours, judging by their simplicity and extreme antiquity, must be the model of

the Rig Veda, having developed independently ever since the first separation, one version developing in one direction and the other in another."[1]

Before printing these hymns or songs, Verković sent them—like samples—to different quarters. To the Ethnographical Exhibition in Moscow in 1867 he sent an "Ancient Bulgarian Orphic Hymn" of which he declared that he had taken it down from an old man of one hundred and five. The hymn, of course, sounded merely like "a fairy tale," as Verković himself admits, but this did not prevent him from printing and publishing it together with others, or even from maintaining in the preface "that the contents of these songs are based on historic truth and on facts which have really taken place," and to point out "that there is more truth in them than in any other similar products of the past, whether European or Asiatic."[2] Even though all Verković's forgeries were exposed at once and without difficulty, this did not in the least deter him from publishing the second volume of his "Veda"[3] seven years later.

Verković is not really remarkable in himself. But he, too, is an important figure in Bulgarian history. He was for a long time the chief and only authority in Russia on matters Macedonian. In fact, one of his works is an "Ethnography of Macedonia" written in Russian. Today the Bulgars refer copiously to him over the Macedonian question—to his songs, his treatises, and reports. For them he is "well-known in the Slav world as an

[1] "Veda Slovena, narodni pesni ot predhistorično i predhristjansko doba, otkril v. Trakija i Makedonia i izdal Stefan I. Verković," 1874, p. x.

[2] Ibid., p. xii.

[3] Petrograd, 1881.

ethnographer and archæologist; he is especially esteemed for his perfect knowledge of Macedonia."[1]

These ideas were held by all Bulgars of the nineteenth century. They were shared also by the Bulgarian historian Gavril Krstović, one of the chief agitators in the Bulgarian Church Question. His "History of the Bulgarian Nation" is full of fables and wild exaggerations concerning the Bulgars and their past. Even Mr. Drinov, the best of the Bulgarian historians, is not entirely free from these ideas.

By such ideas was the Bulgarian awakening accompanied. They permeated the whole of the nation, all its new history, its science, its policy, and all its social and political programme, the rising generation of Bulgaria is brought up on these ideas; all school and instruction are imbued with them.[2]

Armed with ideas of this kind, then, the Bulgars began their propagandist activity in Macedonia and their

[1] A. Ischirkov, "Les confins occidentaux des Terres Bulgares," Lausanne, 1915, p. 231. Mr. Ischirkov is Professor of Geography at the University of Sofia and Member of the Bulgarian Academy of Science.

[2] In Bulgarian school-books we find it is stated that Alexander the Great was a Bulgar, because he was born in Macedonia, and that Aristotle was a Bulgar for the same reason. It is true that he wrote in Greek, but he did so only in order to educate the southern barbarians. He wrote also in Bulgarian, but the Greeks destroyed the MSS. (see *Morning Post* of February 8, 1916). According to Bulgarian school-books Constantine the Great was also a Bulgar, as he was born in Niš, which is—according to them—a Bulgarian town. According to the same authority Cyril and Method are Bulgars, because they were born in Salonica; Aleksa Nenadović and Hajduk Veljko, those heroes of the Serbian liberation, are likewise Bulgars, and also the heroes of the Greek insurrection Botsaris, Karaiskis, Kanaris, Miaulis, and others. (*Cf.* "Države i narodi Balkanskog Poluostrva," translated from the Russian, Belgrade, 1891, pp. 100-101.)

opposition to the Serbian claims to that country. Unfortunately these ideas did not remain confined to the Bulgars. By dint of constant and ubiquitous repetition they had the good fortune to be heard of and taken into consideration. The first and most strongly to be influenced by them was Russia, who regarded the Slavs of Turkey as her oppressed brothers in blood and religion. In Russia there were always Bulgarian refugees. For whereas the refugees from Serbian countries under Turkey always fled to the Serbs, the Bulgars fled to Wallachia, Moldavia, and South Russia.[1] From these the Russians heard of the misery that prevailed in Bulgaria. It was in Russian that Venelin with passionate devotion and fanciful idealism introduced the Bulgarian nation and its fictitious value for Slavdom and for the world. In their war with Turkey towards the end of the thirties of the nineteenth century, the Russians had at last the opportunity of personally observing the miseries of the nation of which Venelin was just at that time writing with so much sympathy and enthusiasm. Added to this came the agitation of the "awakened" Bulgarian patriots in Russia and Roumania. "Bulgarian Committees for the aid of the Danubian Bulgars" were established in Odessa and Bucharest, with the object of making propaganda in Russia and elsewhere for the benefit of the Bulgarian cause. To Bulgaria these Committees sent school and liturgical books, crucifixes, vestments, chalices, and other ecclesiastical furniture. Russia was the first to take a lively interest in the Bulgars. She, too, sent books and subscriptions for the Bulgarian schools and ecclesi-

[1] Pipin and Spasovič, p. 139; G. S. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik" ("A Traveller through the Mountains"), p. 271.

astical furniture for the Bulgarian churches. She was the first to attract and to educate the Bulgarian younger generation, which produced some of the most ardent Bulgarian patriots who then either laboured in Russia or else made propaganda in the Balkan Peninsula. Finally, little by little, Bulgaromania became general in Russia. Even sober men of science were bitten with the Bulgarian craze and prepared to pronounce the whole of the Balkans to be Bulgarian. The learned V. Grigorovič, travelling in the Balkans in 1844, saw only Bulgars wherever he went. Although he noticed a prevailing difference between the speech of the Macedonians and that of the Bulgars, he could not get rid of his Bulgarophilism, and so pronounced all Macedonians to be Bulgars.[1] He also noticed other differences, but being completely fascinated by the Bulgars, he did not think of discriminating between them and the Macedonians.[2] Grigorovič's unquestioned authority only served to strengthen the Russian love for the Bulgars. They were the favourite children of the Great Slav Mother. The Russian Society, "Slavyanskoe Blagotvoritelnoe Obščestvo," established in 1858, laboured untiringly at the propagation of the Bulgarian cause. The ethnographic maps published by the Society were in complete accord with the most ambitious of Bulgarian ideals. In 1870 Russia created the Bulgarian autonomous Church. Finally, when in 1878 it became necessary to establish the Bulgarian State, all Russia was carried away with excitement. Public opinion was stronger than the Government. Thus was created the

[1] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija po evropejskoj Turcii," 1848, pp. 194, 195, 196 (in Russian).

[2] Ibid.

Great Bulgaria of San Stefano, on March 3, 1878—a Bulgaria within whose frame, beside the real Bulgaria, were included Macedonia and a great part of Old Serbia. According to popular opinion in Russia at the time Bulgaria was entitled to an area of 164,000 sq. km. with a population of 4,500,000. And if there had been no Congress of Berlin, 1878, which reduced Bulgaria to her proper ethnical boundaries, the Bulgars would long ago have been masters of the Balkan Peninsula. But although the Bulgaria of San Stefano was not realized, it left a strong impression among the Bulgars. It remained for them a recognized and merely unrealized goal. It has been the dream of the whole of the Bulgarian nation ever since.

From Russia this sympathy for Bulgaria spread all over the world. It was in Russia that the fables of the Bulgars were given wings. Russia was the chief authority on Bulgaria and her chief advocate. Thence the sympathy and help extended by all the world to the unjust aspirations of Bulgaria, to the huge detriment of the just interests of the Serbian nation.

IX (*Continued*)

BULGARIAN ACTION IN MACEDONIA

The Greek Church abuses its power over the Slavs in the Turkish Empire—Slav dissatisfaction—Inability of the Serbs to fight the Greek Church—The Bulgars, assisted by Russia, open their campaign—The Uniate Church (Greek Catholicism) among the Bulgars—The Russians, alarmed at the progress of the Uniate Church, increase their help to the Bulgars—The Greek Patriarch, alarmed at the growth of the Uniate Church, yields to the Bulgars—The Porte, taking the part of the Bulgars, intervenes with the Greek Patriarch, and the Sultan declares the independence of the Bulgarian Church in Turkey—Significance of the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate—Detriment caused to the Serbs in Turkey by the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate—Attitude of the Greek Church towards the Macedonian Serbs—Macedonians begin to turn Uniate—Russia advises them to join the Bulgars in their struggle against the Greek Church—Macedonians help Bulgars, but only to free themselves from the Greek clergy—The Macedo-Roumanians do the same—The Bulgarian Exarchate and Macedonia—Turks side with Bulgars in Macedonia—New Bulgarian bishoprics in Macedonia—Forcible Bulgarization of the Macedonians—Creation of independent Bulgaria—Propaganda in Macedonia from Bulgaria—Many Macedonian Serbs refuse to join the Bulgars—Bulgarian terror among Serbian population of Macedonia—Bulgarian comitadjis in Macedonia—Destruction of Serbian records and monuments in Macedonia

DESPITE Bulgarian zeal, and in spite of the sympathies of Europe, the Bulgars would not have prevailed in Macedonia had they not succeeded in pressing the Church into the service of their national interests. When speaking of the part played

by the Serbian Patriarchate we explained how great is the importance of an autonomous Church in Turkey. The Bulgars contrived to have Macedonia placed under the power of their own autonomous Church, and then drew every advantage from this circumstance that could possibly be drawn from it, to the utmost limit.

Right up to the latter half of the eighteenth century the greater part of Macedonia was from an ecclesiastical point of view under the Serbian Patriarchate, while the smaller part was under the archiepiscopal see of Ochrida. In 1766 the Turks suppressed the Serbian Patriarchate, and in 1767 they suppressed the archiepiscopate of Ochrida. All the powers and rights of these two independent Churches were henceforth transferred to the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople. In this way not only the vast territories which had already been under the Greek Patriarchate before, but also all those regions in the Turkish Empire in which the Church service was conducted in the Slav tongue, were placed under the Greek Patriarchate.

The Greek Patriarchate is above all things a Greek Church. It was never friendly to the Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula. While the Southern Slavs had their independent States in the Middle Ages, their autocephalous Churches were rivals of the Greek Patriarchate. Under the Turkish rule the independent Serbian Church guarded the Serbian nation and its national civilization from the influence of the Greek Church, just as it guarded them from that of the Turks. When the Greek Patriarchate found itself in the proud position of being the chief and sole Orthodox Church in European Turkey, it looked upon it as its duty to suppress every non-Greek national feeling and to foster and strengthen

only Greek sentiment. Only Greek nationality and Greek civilization enjoyed its favour; everything else was persecuted and crushed. None but Greeks could occupy high positions in the Church. From these positions they everywhere protected the Greeks alone, they introduced an exclusively Greek intellectual life, and they invested everything with an exclusively Greek character. The Slavs, no matter what their ability, were never permitted to rise beyond the dignity of a parish priest, and that they could attain only by heavy payments. The Slav office was persecuted, old Slav MSS. were destroyed, the legends in the churches coated over with plaster and replaced by Greek inscriptions. Besides all this the Greek Church was morally in a most corrupt state. Robbery and venality prevailed in high places. Preferment was given only to sycophants and to those who were able to pay well. A bishopric cost about £T1,000 in gold. For gold, ex-cooks and innkeepers were permitted to attain the dignity of a bishop. And other vices of the vilest sort were prevalent in the hierarchy of the Greek Church. Standing by the Turks in all things, truckling to them and bribing them with money, the Greek Church with the help of the Turks exploited the nation and treated it even as the Turks were doing.

This state of affairs produced a profound dissatisfaction with the Greek Church among the Slavs. For this reason, in Serbia—as soon as the country had set itself free—Miloš Obrenović, her prince at that time, made it one of his first cares to separate the Serbian Church from the Greek Patriarchate and to render it independent.

Throughout Turkey, this dissatisfaction with the Greek Church increased from day to day. Nothing

was lacking but a suitable opportunity to begin an open struggle against it. Although the Serbs were far more numerous in Turkey than the Bulgars, they were nevertheless practically debarred from rebelling against the Greek Church. The liberation of Serbia at the expense of Turkey made the Serbian people an object of mingled hate and fear on the part of the Turks. Any movement on the part of the Serbs in Turkey was supposed to be instigated from Serbia. Every Serb in Turkey was considered a rebel. The detachment of the Serbian Church from the Greek Patriarchate increased the hostility of the Greeks towards the Serbs, and stimulated Greek intrigue against them. The Turkish Empire and the Greek Patriarchate became natural allies against the Serbs. The Bulgars were (at that time) in a far better position to fight against the abuses of the Greek Church. They were docile subjects of Turkey, without political aspirations. The Bulgarian State did not as yet exist, and the Turks could not lay it to their charge, as they did to that of the Serbs, that they were agitating abroad for the formation of a free State.

The Bulgars, too, had good reason to be discontented with the Greek Patriarchate. For many years, ever since the Bulgarian Patriarchate in Trnovo was suppressed in 1393, the Greeks had cruelly oppressed the Bulgars. They denationalized them and destroyed all their native civilization. Very early in the day there were voices raised among the Bulgars against the Greeks. Already in the middle of the eighteenth century the Bulgarian historian Pajsije complained bitterly of the Greeks. Venelin relates how, some time about 1794, the Greeks burnt a number of old Bulgarian MSS. at

Trnovo; how the Bulgarian alphabet had ceased to exist; how the Bulgars write the words of their own language in Greek characters or carry on their correspondence entirely in Greek; how the Christian faith has declined among the Bulgars, how priests are scarce, and one may find unbaptized young men of between seventeen and twenty years of age.[1] When, in 1823, the Metropolitan of Sofia discovered the presence of Bulgarian books and antiquities in the village of Cerovina, near Sofia, he ordered the former to be burnt and replaced by Greek books.[2] In 1825 the Metropolitan of Trnovo ordered the burning of the old library of the Bulgarian Patriarchate during the Trnovo period, which had been accidentally re-discovered shortly before.[3] All this provided sufficient cause for the Bulgars to be thoroughly dissatisfied with the Greek Patriarchate.

The denationalized Bulgars, however, did not begin to consider all these matters till Venelin roused them from their torpor. It was precisely through his influence among the more notable Bulgars that the idea of emancipation from the Greeks began to appear. In 1840 the Bulgars begged the Greek Patriarchate that in the Bulgarian counties the Greek language might be replaced by the Bulgarian in the Church services. As this petition was unsuccessful, the Bulgars in 1853 appealed to the Russian Ambassador (in Constantinople), Prince Menshikov, for intervention on their behalf in this matter. But even then they failed to succeed.

[1] J. Venelin, "Zaradi vozbuždenie novobolgarskoj slovesnosti" ("Concerning the Renascence of Neo-Bulgarian Slavdom"), Bucharest, 1842, pp. 11, 27, 34–36 (in Bulgarian).

[2] G. Bousquet, "Histoire du Peuple Bulgare," Paris, 1909, p. 133.

[3] J. Rakovski, "Gorski Putnik" ("A Traveller through the Mountains"), pp. 208, etc.

After the Crimean War, the Porte by a decree on February 16, 1856, promised her Christian subjects that their rights should be respected and their religion protected. On the strength of this the Bulgars demanded that in the Bulgarian eparchies Bulgarian bishops and priests should be appointed, and that in the churches the Bulgarian language should be introduced in place of the Greek. Although the Russian Ambassador supported their petition in Constantinople, the Bulgars were again unsuccessful. In the meantime the Bulgarian agitation increased from day to day, and the interest in the emancipation of the Church was growing even among the mass of the people. In December 1858, the Bulgars again presented a petition to the Greek Patriarch, demanding that no bishops should be appointed in the Bulgarian eparchies who were not acquainted with the Bulgarian language. The Holy Synod of the Greek Patriarchate refused even this demand, but promised that it would consider the matter. Although four members of the Holy Synod were actually Bulgars (from Philippopolis, Vidin, Sofia, and Trnovo) the Bulgarian request was in the end definitely refused in February 1860. This was the signal for fresh agitations. By this time the Bulgars possessed books and newspapers. Four Bulgarian printing presses (in Constantinople, Trnovo, Šumen, and Philippopolis) were busily turning out inflammatory books and newspapers. The nation was aroused. In many places the populace, with newfound fanaticism, expelled the Greek priests from the churches and refused the bishops their stipends. But the whole of this Bulgarian Church movement has no connection with Macedonia. It concerned the Bulgars only, and not the Serbs in Macedonia.

One contemporary circumstance proved a decisive factor in favour of the Bulgars by winning them Russia's unlimited help, and the Bulgars took every possible advantage of it. In consequence of the dissensions between the Bulgars and the Greek Patriarchate, a Uniate propaganda began to make headway in Bulgaria. This propaganda offered the Bulgars what the Patriarchate had refused even to think of giving them.[1] It offered them, if they went over to the Uniate faith, emancipation from the Greeks, divine service in the Bulgarian language, bishops whom they need not pay, help for intellectual requirements, school and church books, and everything else needed to elevate the Bulgarian nationality. In its outer form the Uniate Church does not differ in the least from the Orthodox. Moreover, the advantages it offered suited the needs of the Bulgars. The common people took to it very sympathetically. Conversions to the Uniate Church became frequent. In order to dismay Russia, the Bulgarian leaders showed themselves especially enthusiastic supporters of the Uniate movement. In order to make the danger appear more pressing to the Russians, many of them became converts to the Uniate Church. One of the first converts was Cankov, a popular leader at that time and subsequently one of the most prominent men of free Bulgaria.[2]

The news of the spread of the Uniate faith among the Bulgars came to the Russians like a bolt from the blue. Bigoted Orthodox Russia did not lose a moment

[1] Uniates being members of any Eastern Christian Church acknowledging the Papal supremacy but retaining their own liturgy.

[2] That this movement was really only intended to force Russia's hand is proved by the fact that Cankov and the rest of the Bulgarian leaders eventually all reverted to the Orthodox faith.

in doing all she could to check the Uniate movement. Every Bulgarian wish received attention. From this time forth Bulgarian demands, however extravagant, and Russian support went hand in hand; the Bulgars proposed and the Russians disposed.

This spread of Uniacy was to the detriment of Orthodoxy in general. The Greek Patriarch, too, became alarmed, and announced that he was prepared to meet the Bulgars as far as possible, so that they would remain in the Orthodox fold. The Bulgars at once increased their demands, and insisted upon the autonomy of the Bulgarian Church. In other words, the Bulgars demanded an independent head of their Church, to be elected only by the Bulgars and whose seat would be in Constantinople; furthermore, that all Bulgarian bishops should be elected only by Bulgarian priests, and that they must be confirmed in their dignity by the head of the Bulgarian Church; and that the administration of the Bulgarian Church should be entrusted exclusively to the Bulgars. The Patriarch was willing to yield to the Bulgars, but only as regards the truly Bulgarian counties, between the Danube and the Balkan chain. He therefore requested the Bulgars to define the scope of their future Church.

Having gained Russia's help and the acquiescence of the Greek Church, the Bulgars now showed themselves in their true colours: "Let us get what we can, no matter if it belongs to others." The dream of a great Bulgaria and of a hegemony over the nations of the Near East began to appear as a realizable goal. The Bulgars rejected the proposal of the Patriarch, and began with fresh agitations and threats. The Patriarch endeavoured to allay the Bulgarian tempest by a letter

promising to accede to all the Bulgarian demands in all eparchies that were truly Bulgarian. The Bulgars were not satisfied with this either, but applied to the Porte and began to negotiate with her direct. While the Porte was still considering the Bulgarian Church question, the Bulgars presented their ultimatum: a free Church or rebellion! Partly the Bulgarian unrest, but vastly more the influence of the Russian Ambassador prevailed with the Porte to submit a scheme for the solution of the Græco-Bulgarian imbroglio to the Greek Patriarch in October 1868. In an accompanying letter to the Patriarch the Porte declared that this question could no longer be permitted to remain open, and that it was a State necessity to satisfy the Bulgars. In this scheme the Porte demanded that wherever the Bulgars constituted the majority, it was they who should elect the priests; that their bishops should be Bulgars, and that the head of the Bulgarian Church should reside in Constantinople, whence he would with his Synod minister to the ecclesiastical needs of the Bulgars. The Greek Patriarchate had not yet fully considered this scheme when the Bulgars announced it in all their eparchies as a *fait accompli*. This was a decisive step in the detachment of the Bulgars from the Greek Patriarchate. The Patriarch considered their attitude quite illegal, and appealed to all the Orthodox Churches, inviting them to a Œcumenical Council to deal with the question. This Council never met. The Porte, thanks to Russia's endeavours, settled the matter herself instead. Without paying any attention to the Greek Patriarchate, the Porte in 1869 arranged, and on February 28, 1870, by a firman from the Sultan announced the establishment of an independent Bulgarian Church under the name of

the Bulgarian Exarchate, whose See was to be in Constantinople.

The creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate gave a new direction to the development of conditions in the Christian territories of the Turkish Empire. The establishment was a great blow to the Greeks. The new Bulgarian Exarchate not only deprived the Greek Patriarchate of a great part of its territory, but became a danger, threatening to wrest from the Greek Patriarchate even the remaining Slavs who were left under it. As for the Serbs, they found a new enemy in the Bulgarian Exarchate, an enemy who was under Russia's protection and enjoyed the favour of the Porte. By their solicitude and success in the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate the Russians established a great prestige for themselves among the Slavs of the Turkish Empire as the all-powerful protectors of Slav Orthodoxy, while in that same Exarchate they found a channel for their own political activities in Turkey. The Turks also considered that by the creation of the Exarchate they had scored a great political success. They imagined that by the establishment of the Exarchate they had killed the prestige of the Greek Patriarchate, which had served as a screen for the policy of Greece, that by it a focus was created in Constantinople, towards which all the Slavs of the Turkish Empire would gravitate, including the Serbs, whose gravitation towards Serbia was considered so dangerous. The Bulgars made the fullest use of their Exarchate. They not only received an autonomous Church, but the incidental conditions established by it were also all to their advantage. The defeat of the Greek Patriarchate and the weakening of the ties between Serbia and the Slavs under the Turks, Russia's

increased prestige and her policy in the Balkans, and the gravitation of the Slavs in Turkey towards Constantinople—all this was greatly in favour of the Bulgars.

These were the conditions under which the Bulgarian Exarchate began its activities. The Bulgarian Exarch was not only head of the Bulgarian Church and protector of the Slav liturgy, but also the representative of the Bulgarian people with the Sultan and his ministers, the protector of Bulgarian interests, and the inaugurator of the improvement and revival of Bulgarian culture and nationality. Abundant funds, which the eparchies readily contributed, were employed without delay in improving Bulgarian education. Schools were opened throughout the extent of the Exarchate. Large numbers of students were sent to high schools, especially to Russia. All Bulgaria pulsated with new life. The people, wearied of their ill-treatment by the Greeks and anxious for the introduction of the Slav language in the Church service, rallied enthusiastically around their leaders.

Already at the outset the Bulgarian Exarchate inflicted a grave injury upon the Serbian nation. It did *not* limit itself to the Bulgarian counties. Besides the Bulgarian, several purely Serbian eparchies were included in its jurisdiction, viz. the Eparchies of Niš, Pirot, Čustendil, Samokov and Veles, which had been under the Serbian Patriarchate until the latter half of the eighteenth century. Although in Macedonia only the eparchy of Veles was assigned to the Exarchate, yet this was the beginning of Bulgaria's full-blown activity in Macedonia.

* * * * *

The Serbs in Macedonia were also greatly tyrannized

over by the Greeks. Immediately after the suppression of the Serbian Patriarchate we begin to hear of discontent in Macedonia with the heads of the Greek Church. In 1791 a priest named Antim was appointed Metropolitan of Skoplje. He was of purely Greek origin. A Serbian monk of the Monastery of Lesnovo has given us the following description of the Metropolitan Antim:—"A great lover of lucre, who cares naught for the canon because of his covetousness. The monasteries are rank with simony, he cares neither for the Church, nor the poor, nor the widows. He bestows no alms and exacts taxes from the monasteries."[1] Elsewhere the position was no better: "Throughout Macedonia from Salonica to Ochrida, and from the frontiers of Thessaly up to Skoplje and Melnik, not only in the places where the Metropolitans have their residence, but even in the village churches, divine service is being celebrated in the Greek tongue."[2] The few Serbian schools that remained were unable to counteract the Greek influence. Plenty of people were in the habit of using the Greek alphabet even when they had to write in Serbian. The national customs, to which the Serbian people are deeply attached, were persecuted. The Greek priests particularly strove to eradicate the "Slava," a universal Serbian custom which is kept as a sign of Serbian nationality, and to replace it by Greek customs.[3]

This conduct on the part of the Greek priests exasperated the Serbian population of Macedonia. Upon the

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 3759.

[2] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija po Evropejskoj Turcii," p. 186.

[3] Iv. S. Jastrebov, "Običai i pjesni tureckih Serbov," Petrograd, 1886, p. 3 (in Russian).

appearance of the Uniate propaganda, the Macedonians, too, began to be converted by it. The centre of this propaganda was at Kukuš in Southern Macedonia, where the Uniates established a church in 1857. The Bulgars were not slow to turn this popular discontent and the spread of the Uniate faith in Macedonia to their own advantage. In the dissatisfaction of the Macedonian Serbs with the Greek rule the Bulgars found corroboration of what they themselves always alleged against the Greeks, and on the other hand it provided them with a further field for their activities. While the Bulgars were drawing the attention of the Russians to the activity of the Uniates in Macedonia, they were themselves doing their best to win over the Macedonians to join the Bulgarian movement against the Greeks. Orthodox Russia likewise considered the presence of the Uniate communities in Macedonia a danger to Slav Orthodoxy, and so began to send her agents to dissuade the populace from joining the former and to promise that the Serbian question in Macedonia should be solved together with the Bulgarian Church question. Looking upon Russia as the protectress of Slav Orthodoxy, the Macedonians listened to these counsels and helped to further the Bulgarian cause, upon the success of which their own cause was likewise to depend. The Uniate movement weakened, and support for the Bulgarian movement increased. Thus began the *rapprochement* between the Macedonian Serbs and the Bulgars.

When the agitation against the Greeks and the conversions to the Uniate faith first began in Macedonia nobody thought of the Bulgars. It was only a question of emancipation from the Greek Patriarchate and the

restoration of the national tongue in the Church offices. When the Uniate Church in Kukuš was consecrated in 1857, it received the inscription: "On March 1st, 1857, our lost mother tongue was restored to us." [1] Better than anything else, this inscription reveals the motives of the Serbs in Macedonia when they went over to the Uniate faith. When the Russians entered the lists against the Uniate movement the Serbs were left but one way of attaining emancipation from the Greeks, and that was to join the Bulgarian movement. This step did not imply Bulgarization, but only a joint struggle against the Greeks for the use of the Slav tongue in the Church.

That the struggle, which the Macedonians had from the very first waged against the Greeks, did not bear a Bulgarian character, nor prove that the Macedonians wished to become Bulgars, is best shown by the adherence of the Roumanians of Macedonia to the Bulgarian cause. The Roumanians in Macedonia suffered the same wrongs at the hands of the Greek priests as did the Slav Christians. So the Roumanians, too, began to rebel. Like the Serbs, they too joined the Bulgars and waged a struggle for a native clergy and use of the national tongue in the Church. In many localities they for a long time acted jointly with the Bulgars. When the Bulgarian Exarchate was created, they recognized it as their own. In Ochrida, about eighty Roumanian families were under the Bulgarian Exarchate until the nineties of last century.[2] But no

[1] Iv. Ivanić, "Iz crkvene istorije Srba u Turskoj" ("Church History of the Serbs in Turkey in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries"), p. 41.

[2] P. Balkanski, "Kroz Groblje" ("Through the Graveyard"), Belgrade, 1894, pp. 55–62.

one could say of these Roumanians, who from practical considerations had joined the Bulgarian movement, that they had done so as Bulgars, and it would be equally false to say so of the Serbs.

The true epoch of Bulgarian influence in Macedonia only dates from the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. In the second clause of Art. 10 of the Imperial firman, whereby the Bulgarian Exarchate was established, there occurs the following passage: "If the inhabitants of any other places besides those enumerated above, and professing the Orthodox faith, should wish unanimously, or if at least two-thirds of them should wish to be subject to the Bulgarian Exarchate, and if subsequent investigation should prove this to be so, their desire ought to be gratified." The Bulgars did not lose a moment in doing their very best to turn this clause to good account. The new Bulgarian bishops of these eparchies, one of which was actually in Macedonia, while others were in close proximity to it, inaugurated a spirited propaganda in order to win the Serbian inhabitants to the Bulgarian Exarchate. No one interfered with this agitation. The bishops as well as their agents were Turkish subjects. Turkey not only trusted them, but she helped them. It was to her interest to attach the Serbs to the Bulgarian Exarchate in Constantinople, and to diminish their inclination to gravitate towards Serbia. As the Greek priests were still masters in Macedonia, and the use of the Slav language in the Church was persecuted, and Serbian schools and Serbian intellectual life were at the last gasp, the Bulgarian agents found no difficulty in carrying on their propaganda. In place of the hated Greek Patriarchate they offered the people the protection of the Slav Bulgarian Exarchate, the creation of Slav

Russia; in place of the Greek language in the Church they offered them the Slav language, the common hieratic tongue of the Serbs, Russians, and Bulgars; in place of the Greek schools, they gave them to understand that there was a prospect of national schools. Exasperated by the Greeks and cut off from Serbia, the Macedonians were on the horns of a dilemma. The choice lay between three evils, viz. either to continue under the Greeks or to abandon their faith and become Uniates, or to come under the Bulgarian Exarchate. The decision was difficult. How difficult it was is best shown by the fact that the nation was by no means unanimous in its decision. A part remained true to the Greeks, part clung to the Uniate faith, and a third part joined the new Bulgarian movement.

The adherents of the Bulgarian movement sent in a petition for the establishment of Bulgarian bishoprics in Skoplje and Ochrida. A Turkish commission was sent down from Constantinople, before which the inhabitants had to declare whether they acknowledged the Exarchate or not. This commission, too, did much to further the Bulgarian cause in Macedonia. It used considerable pressure in order to induce the inhabitants to declare themselves for the Bulgarian Exarchate. It openly threatened that all Macedonians who should refuse to join the Bulgars would be denounced as agents of Greece and Serbia. By these means the necessary majority was obtained, and in 1872 Bulgarian bishops were duly installed in the dioceses of Ochrida and Skoplje.

The two new bishops were great Bulgarian agitators. Their first and chiefest care was the obliteration of all Serbian memories in Macedonia. A whole army of priests and teachers was sent from Bulgaria to Mace-

donia. All written matter emanating from the Church and the denominational school communities became Bulgarian. The birth, marriage, and death certificates issued by the priests to the people began to be written in Bulgarian. All documents bore Bulgarian superscriptions and seals. Persons who could not write were entered in the *osmanlie* (papers giving a person's name, surname, religion, nationality, and occupation, and with which every Turkish subject must be provided) as Bulgars by the Bulgarian priests and schoolmasters. On the strength of these papers, the Macedonians were then entered in the official registers as Bulgars. Thus Macedonia began gradually to be outwardly Bulgarized.

When in 1876 war broke out between Serbia and Turkey, the Bulgars, too, made a move to liberate themselves from the Turks. Incensed at this conduct on the part of the Bulgars, the Porte put down the Bulgarian bishoprics in Macedonia. The Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia was not greatly impaired by this step. On the one hand the oppressions of the Greek priests were still too fresh in men's memories, and on the other hand the propagandist machinery set up by the Bulgars in Macedonia continued to operate there.

The Russo-Turkish war of 1877–1878 was the greatest stroke of luck ever vouchsafed to the Bulgars. By that war Russia presented Bulgaria with freedom and a State. Beside their sympathies for the oppressed Slavs in general, the Russians had a special interest in Bulgaria. They believed that "gratitude would bind the Bulgars to Russia for ever, and that if Russia were to unite them in an independent State, the Russians would find a devoted and faithful instrument in that State." [1]

[1] Max Choublier, "La question d'Orient," Paris, 1897, p. 85.

It was quite natural to assume that Bulgaria's gratitude would be in proportion to the size of the State in question and also that the greater this State, the stronger would be Russia's support in the Balkan Peninsula. These were the reasons that moved Russia in 1878 to create the great Bulgaria of San Stefano, in the frame of which were included not only Macedonia, but other Serbian provinces as well. Although the Congress of Berlin reduced the frontiers of the Bulgarian State to the limits of the Bulgarian nation, yet a deep impression was left upon the Bulgarian mind by the Bulgaria of San Stefano. The Bulgars felt as if the Congress of Berlin had robbed them of something that belonged to them. Since then the Bulgaria of San Stefano has been their ideal. Many Macedonians, having been for months under the impression that if Russia had had her way they would have belonged to Bulgaria, and that it was by the Congress of Berlin and against Russia's wish, that they were being redelivered into Turkish slavery, regretted the freedom they had so recently enjoyed. Serbia was not only not even taken into consideration as a possible owner of Macedonia, but she was actually expelled from those countries which she had won with her blood. The impression gained by the Macedonians at the time was that they had nothing to hope from Serbia. This impression, more than anything else, caused the Macedonians to waver in their Serbian feeling.

Meantime the Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia was pursued with relentless energy from the Bulgarian State. Those Bulgars who had been educated abroad by the Russian Committees and had lived as emigrants in Europe now returned to Bulgaria, fanatically devoted

to Great Bulgarian ideas. One of the chief cares of these men was to reopen that agitation for a Great Bulgaria which had been so successfully started before and had received definite expression in the Treaty of San Stefano. The Exarchate continued to rémain in Constantinople, but was now in closest touch with the Bulgarian Government. With money provided by the Bulgarian State budget, the Exarchate created a special department called the "Skolsko Popečiteljstvo" (School Department), which maintained a whole army of agents in Macedonia. The denominational schools in Macedonia became so many branches of the School Department of the Bulgarian Exarchate. Finally, directly the war was over the Bulgars began to work not only for the return of the forfeited Bulgarian dioceses in Macedonia, but also for the creation of new ones.

Thus were established conditions under which the Serbian population had to submit to the Exarchate if it wished to remain Slav and to live in peace. All Macedonians know that their ancestors were Serbs, and a good many remember that in their youth the Bulgars were unknown in their country (see Supplements Nos. I, II, and III). The following example alone will suffice to show how successful was the Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia: In the days before the Bulgarian Exarchate there came to Veles as Serbian schoolmaster George Miletić, the brother of Svetosar Miletić, the Serbian national leader in Hungary. He was in Macedonia at the time of the struggle for emancipation from the Greeks. As a good Serb he also supported the struggle, but threw in his lot with those who, taking Russia's advice, joined the Bulgarian movement, and he became a Bulgarian leader in Macedonia. To-day his son Ljubimir Miletić (whose

name and surname are both Serbian) is professor at the University of Sofia, and one of the bitterest Serbophobes.

But in spite of all hatred of the Greeks, in spite of the inducement of the Slav liturgy offered by the Bulgarian Church, and in spite of the Bulgarian propaganda, the Bulgarian success in Macedonia was never complete. A great part of the nation continued to remain Serbian in its feelings. One-third of the inhabitants, fearing Bulgarization, actually preferred to remain under the hated Greek Patriarchate rather than go over to the Bulgarian Exarchate. Many of those who joined the Exarchate out of hatred for the Greeks still remained Serbs in their feeling. The best proof of this is to be found in the pro-Serbian insurrection against the Turks, in the appeals to the Congress of Berlin not to hand them over to Bulgaria (see Supplément No. IV), and in the secret agitations in favour of Serbia.

This positively expressed Serbian feeling on the part of the Macedonians the Bulgars endeavoured to stifle either by espionage and denunciation to the Turkish authorities or by direct terror. Nowhere and never have there been such espionage and denunciation as the Bulgars practised in Macedonia. The Bulgarian bishops, priests, schoolmasters, and agents knew no bounds in their campaign against the Serbs. They falsely accused the Serbs of high treason, conspiracy, and of the vilest crimes. Turkish justice was very summary, and the sentences were inhuman. We will quote but one instance. On April 10, 1881, Spira Crnčević and seventy-two of his friends declared that they felt themselves to be Serbs. The Bulgars denounced them

as traitors and handed Spira over to the Turks. The Turks put Spira to death and exposed his head in public at Kumanovo as a warning to others. A vast number of Serbs paid with their heads or with incarceration in Salonica, Asia Minor, and the islands of the Archipelago for their Serbian feeling.

The Bulgarian terror was even more appalling. The Bulgars did not shrink from any baseness in their attempt to stifle Serbian feeling in Macedonia. The opening of every Serbian school was attended by hostile demonstrations or attacks from the Bulgars. On these occasions there were bloodshed and murder. The Turkish authorities were always on the side of the Bulgars. The Bulgars did not even shrink from assaulting helpless Serbian female teachers and innocent Serbian schoolboys. In 1899 they assaulted two Serbian female teachers in Kruševo, Olga Vukojević and Zlata Krstić. Krstić fell ill from the shock and died soon afterwards. In a raid upon the Serbian school in Bitolj (Monastir) the local Bulgarian professor wounded George Vojvodić, a lad attending the Serbian Lycée (or Boys' High School). An incomplete list of such assaults upon Serbian schools, churches, and teachers appears in the Supplement at the end of this volume (see Supplement No. V).

The worst period of the Bulgarian terror in Macedonia set in when the Serbian population began to express its Serbian feeling and to demand Serbian schools and Serbian priests. From that time dates the systematic assassination of Serbs. Already in 1884, Cvetko Popović, schoolmaster in Lukovo, was murdered by the Bulgars. After that, these murders became more frequent. In 1885 the Bulgars founded com-

mittees in Roumelia for making propaganda in Macedonia. In 1886, inspired by these committees, began secret ruffianly attacks upon everybody and everything that hindered the Bulgars in Macedonia. Whole bands were despatched by the Bulgarian Government to suppress Serbian feeling. At a general meeting of all the Bulgarian Committees in Sofia in 1894, the so-called "Spoljna Organizacija" (foreign organization) was formed for the purpose of bringing about the autonomy of the Bulgarian regions in Turkey. In 1896 the Bulgars founded the "Unutrašnja Organizacija" (internal organization), which was an organizing committee in Macedonia. This body even included several Macedonians who had been bought; but both the money and the guiding spirit proceeded from Bulgaria. Its purpose was to put an end to the Serbs. Never will the Serbian population forget the branches of this organization which ramified all over Macedonia. The name of "Bulgarian Comitadji" is notorious throughout the world. Threats, blackmail, incendiarism, murder, the expulsion of whole village communities—these were the exploits perpetrated wholesale by the Bulgars. Led by John Varnelija (from Varna) and Pan Arnaut, a band of comitadjis from Bulgaria attacked the inhabitants of the neighbourhood of Veles, with intent to murder all who refused to declare themselves Bulgars. The terror was appalling. By 1900 the obstinately Serbian village of Orahovac was completely depopulated and destroyed. There were many similar instances. Even an incomplete list of the murders committed upon notable Serbs in Macedonia by the Bulgars up to 1907 is appalling (see Supplement No. VI). In the neighbourhood of Kumanovo and

Kriva Palanka, the Bulgars in 1905, within less than five months, murdered fifty-nine highly respected Serbian priests, schoolmasters, and citizens.[1]

But even this terror sometimes failed to achieve its object. The innate Serbian feeling of the Macedonians could not be completely eradicated. From time to time it showed in unmistakable clearness. Any such manifestation was met by the Bulgars in a truly ferocious spirit. We will quote a single instance. In 1899 the peasants of the village of Rabrovo in the county of Strumica declared that they had been duped and terrorized by the Bulgars into signifying their adherence to the Exarchate, but that they felt that they were Serbs, that they could no longer hide

[1] J. H. Vasiljević, "Ustanak Srba u Kumanovskoji Palanačkoj Kazi u 1878" ("Insurrection of the Serbs in the Kumanovo and Palanca Districts"), Belgrade, 1906, pp. 1–13. Some very characteristic examples of the abominable action of the Bulgarian Comitadjis in Macedonia may be gleaned from a report submitted to the Bulgarian Government by a Bulgarian consular representative ("Le Brigandage en Macédoine, un rapport confidentiel au gouvernement bulgare," Berlin, 1908). As a matter of fact, the Bulgars themselves made no secret of the terror in Macedonia and the slaughter of the Serb inhabitants. In repelling the attacks of the Serbian press on account of the Macedonian murders, the Bulgarian paper *Blgarija* (1898, Nos. 103 and 104) openly commends the action of the assassins of the Serbs: "The Serbian press, by publishing news of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee in Macedonia and its purpose to overthrow the Turkish rule, is playing the part of a spy. Revolutionists, wherever they are, punish spies by putting them to death. The Macedonian secret revolutionary Committees are not more lenient than others to those who spy upon them in Macedonia. . . . Had the Serbs made this clear to their own agitators, it is possible that the murders in Ochrida, Gevgeli, and Bitolj would not have occurred. . . ." The paper *Reforma* (1899, No. 6), praising the assassin of the Serbian priest Todor Pop-Antić in Prilep, says that "with exceptional devotion and exemplary courage he carried out a patriotic deed. . . ."

their feelings, and that they wished to secede from the Exarchate. The leader of these victimized Serbs was their parish priest Aleksa. For this the Bulgars took a horrible vengeance upon him. They first set fire to his house, and then cut to pieces his wife, his brother, his daughter-in-law, and two children.

Under these appalling conditions, under the protection of the Turkish Empire, the helpless Serbian inhabitant of Macedonia was compelled to yield to the Bulgarian comitadji, bishop, priest, schoolmaster, and agent—to attend the Bulgarian church, send his children to the Bulgarian school, and to obey orders from Sofia.

While the Bulgars were thus killing Serbian nationality in Macedonia, they took care to destroy everything else that could recall the Serbs. The Serbian relics in Macedonia were a great stumbling-block to the Bulgars. Every memento of the Serbs was to disappear, and they spared nothing in their fanaticism. The old MSS., the pictures of Serbian kings and saints, the legends and inscriptions in books and churches—all were destroyed. We have not at this moment a list available of all that the Bulgars have destroyed in Macedonia, but we will quote a few examples, which will amply serve as illustrations.

Near Skoplje, in the Suhorečka Župa, stands to this day the old Serbian monastery of St. Demitrius, built by the Serbian king Vukašin (1366–1371) and his sons Marko, Andreaš, Ivaniš, and Dmitar.[1] In this monastery many old Serbian writings, both books and MSS., had been preserved. The whole interior of the monastery was decorated with frescoes representing Serbian saints and kings of the day of the Nemanjići. At the beginning

[1] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. iii. p. 157.

of the Bulgarian propaganda in Serbia two strangers from Bulgaria cajoled the local inhabitants into letting them become custodians of this monastery. They then employed a certain Bulgarian monk, named Dionisiji, to destroy the Serbian relics in the monastery and appointed him head of the monastery. For a whole month Dionisiji used the Serbian MSS. to light fires with until he had burned them all. But he did not stop there. Being a painter of sorts, he plastered over the pictures of the Serbian kings and the legends attached to them, and on the coating of plaster he painted fantastic and meaningless pictures of birds and snakes. When the peasants found out what the monk was doing it was too late. They were barely in time to save the picture of King Marko, and to clean the pictures of St. Sava Nemanjić and Tsar Uroš, which were not yet dry. Because of this conduct the peasants procured the dismissal of the monk, but of course the books and MSS. were gone past recall. To make up for all the damage he did, Dionisiji bequeathed to posterity his own portrait on the outer wall of the church, with the legend "Dionisiji, Zoograf, B'lgarin" (Dionysius, painter, Bulgar). This outrage by the Bulgarian agitators was reported by an eye-witness, P. Srećković,[1] professor of history at the University of Belgrade. The Russian academician N. P. Kondakov, who traversed Macedonia in 1900 for the purpose of studying old Macedonian art, speaks with deep regret of this act of abominable vandalism in the monastery of St. Dmitar "which was perpetrated by the hatred of the Bulgarian clergy upon the relics of the old Serbian civilization." The frescoes representing the founder of this monastery were destroyed "because

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xlvi. p. 221.

they constituted a record of the Serbian domination in these parts, and out of Bulgarian patriotism." [1]

In the Monastery of Mlado Nagoričino the Bulgars destroyed an inscription dated from 1330, which referred to the victory of the Serbs over the Bulgars in that year.[2]

On an icon in the Monastery of St. Clement's in Ochrida there were inscriptions and emblems recalling the Serbian State in Macedonia. The Bulgars destroyed them all.[3]

Two hours' walk from Zletovo, in the cliffs above the River Zletovo, is the old Serbian Monastery of Uspenje Svete Bogorodice. In it is preserved the picture of one of the old kings of Serbia. The legend attached to the picture, giving his name and recalling the days of the Serbian rule in Macedonia, was effaced by the Bulgarian priest Teodosije from Zletovo.[4]

Prince Miloš Obrenović (1815–1839) and Prince Alexander Karagjorgjvić (1842–1859), the father of King Peter, each presented the monastery of St. John Bigorski near Debar with a large bell. Round each bell runs an inscription saying that this gift was presented by the Serbian prince in question to the Serbian monastery. The Bulgars tried to obliterate these legends by hammering them. But the metal was too hard, and although the letters are damaged they are still perfectly legible.

Such were the trials through which the Serbian nation and its civilization in Macedonia were called upon to pass. If they have so far survived, it is only a proof of the vitality of the Serbian people and its national conscience in Macedonia.

[1] N. P. Kondakov, "Makedonija," Petrograd, 1909, p. 184 (in Russian).

[2] Ibid., p. 195.

[3] Ibid., p. 262.

[4] Iv. Ivanić, "Macedonia and Macedonians," i, pp. 87–88 Serbian).

X

SERBIA AND MACEDONIA

Serbia the refuge for the Macedonians—Macedonians accepted as Serbs in Serbia—Macedonians always considered foreigners in Bulgaria—Serbian public opinion looks upon Macedonians as forming part of the Serbian nation—So do Serbia's statesmen—So does Serbian science—Non-Serbian science takes the same view—Serbia welcomes Bulgarian immigrants and assists the Bulgarian Church movement so long as Bulgaria does not lay claim to Macedonia also—Serbia's inability to check Bulgarian encroachment in Macedonia—Serbian interest in Macedonia—Serbian schools opened—Assistance of the Serbian Church movement in Macedonia—Macedonians as guardians of Serbian nationality—Serbian schools in Macedonia—Macedonians petition for a restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate—Failing in this request, they ask for Serbian bishops—Insurrection in Macedonia in favour of annexation to Serbia—Macedonians appeal to Prince Milan of Serbia and to the Congress of Berlin to be permitted to belong to Serbia, and not to Bulgaria—Macedonians' brave fight against Bulgarian comitadjis—In spite of all Bulgarian propaganda the better part of Macedonia remains Serbian—The rest ostensibly sides with the Bulgars

FREE Serbia was created by the united efforts of the whole Serbian nation from all Serbian lands. In this patriotic rally, as we have seen, the Macedonians played a very prominent part. From the day of her creation Serbia not only knew herself to be the common heritage of the Serbian people, but realized that she had been called into being to be the centre whence the sufferings of the Serbian nation were to be allayed and

the liberation of all Serbs still remaining in foreign bondage was to be prepared. By taking this view of her position, Serbia looked with equal and impartial interest upon all parts of the Serbian nation under the foreign yoke. Macedonia was not in the least left out in the cold. From the very first day of Serbia's liberation, the most cordial relations were established between her and Macedonia.

All Macedonians who helped in the creation of Serbia remained in the country to enjoy its freedom. Many of them rose to high positions in Serbia; they had charge of her destinies and, in short, reaped the full reward of their labour and devotion.

From the first, free Serbia was the refuge of all Serbs who languished in foreign slavery. These Serbs, too, either because they were flying from persecution or because they desired freedom, found a true motherland in Serbia. We are not at present in possession of all the particulars regarding the Macedonians who settled in Serbia after her liberation. But we know one particular detail which clearly indicates the considerable proportion of this immigration. We have before us a list of the members of the Tailors' Guild in Belgrade, dating from the time of the reign of Prince Miloš Obrenović (1815–1839).[1] From this list we learn that there were at that time in the tailoring trade in Belgrade alone—besides Serbs from Serbia and from other unliberated regions—no fewer than twenty-five Macedonians, as from Tetovo, Debar, Prilep, Bitolj, Kruševo, Ochrida, Klisura, Blace, Kostur, and Seres. From this list it is easy to guess how great must have been the number of

[1] We copied this list already in 1910 from the original in the archives of the Tailors' Union (Terzijski Esnaf) in Belgrade.

Macedonians engaged in various professions throughout the whole of Serbia.

These Serbs from Macedonia not only found a home in Serbia, but from the first day of their sojourn there, they were regarded as full citizens equally with all other Serbs, so that they felt themselves to be indeed in their own country. Their ranks included labourers, merchants, clerks, public men, and politicians. But they were not mere settlers. They contributed their quota to the intellectual progress of Serbia from every point of view. Together with the Serbs of Serbia we find them the founders of public institutions, the improvers of commerce and industry and patrons of letters and literature. Merely among the subscribers for certain books which were published during the reign of Prince Miloš Obrenović, we have found hundreds of names of Macedonian Serbs from Skoplje, Veles, Kratovo, Kumanovo, Razlog, Serez, Salonica, Selce, Prilep, Kruševo, Bitolj, Ochrida, Mecovo, Kostur, Blace, Klisura, Moskopolje, etc. These people lived scattered in various places all over Serbia, and followed widely different professions.

Descendants of these Macedonians and fresh immigrants from Macedonia have arisen to positions of the highest importance in Serbia. They have become Ministers of State, councillors, politicians, generals. They often held the fate not only of Serbia, but of the entire Serbian nation in their hands. All of them were pure Serbs and ardent patriots.[1]

[1] We will name only a few of the most distinguished Macedonians in Serbia:

Nikola P. Pašić, the present Serbian Premier, and leader of the Radical Party. His family originally came from Tetovo; *Dr. Vladan Gjorgjevitch*, at one time Serbian Premier, member of the

All of which might be answered by the statement that Macedonians have also migrated to liberated Bulgaria. This is true; but there is a great difference between Macedonian emigration to Serbia and Macedonian emigration to Bulgaria. To Serbia the Macedonians went as to their own country, for whose liberation they had fought. They went there for the love of her, to labour at the advancement of Serbia, in whose progress they saw their own advancement as well. To Bulgaria they went only after a great propaganda had exerted its influence—after it had been suggested to them; they went as graduates of the Bulgarian schools, to occupy well-paid appointments in Bulgaria, or as recipients of allowances, or as paid agitators. In Serbia no difference is made between Serbs and Macedonians; both are but one nation. In Bulgaria the difference between Bulgars and Macedonians persists for a long time because, in the words of a Bulgarian professor, "the Macedonians find a difficulty in acquiring the modern Bulgarian idiom."[1] In Bulgaria we find the special derogatory nickname "Makedonstvu-

Academy of Science, and a well-known man of letters, a native of the district of Bitolj; *Dr. Lazar Patchou*, at one time Minister of Finance, likewise from the district of Bitolj; *Nikola Stefanović*, a former Minister of Police, from Mavrovo, Gostivar district; *Kosta Stojanović*, a former Minister of Commerce, and member of the Skupština, from Malovište, near Bitolj; *General Dimitrije Cincar-Marković*, at one time Minister of War, from Ochrida; *Mihajlo G. Ristić*, Serbian Minister in Rome, from Prilep; *General Lazar, Lazarević*, from Moskopolje, near Bitolj; *General Lazar Petrović*, first aide-de-camp to the late King Alexander Obrenović, from Bašino Selo, near Veles; *Svetolik Popović*, ex-Under-Secretary of State for Public Works, from Ljubinac, Skoplje district; *Branislav Dj. Nušić*, Serbian poet and well-known author, from Bitolj, etc.

[1] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-Slavjanski Sbornik" ("Macedonian Slav Collection"), i., Petrograd, 1894, p. iv.

jušći," which denotes a special party, and which is met with constantly as a colloquial and journalistic expression. In Serbia the Macedonians are loved as brothers, as part of the Serbian people. In Bulgaria the Macedonians are disliked and only tolerated from considerations of policy. Mr. Stambulov, one of Bulgaria's greatest statesmen and patriots, was typical of the ordinary feeling of the Bulgars towards the Macedonians in his cordial dislike of the latter.[1]

Public opinion of the nation at large in Serbia has always looked upon Macedonia as a Serbian country. The national ballads collected among non-Macedonian Serbs at the beginning of the nineteenth century sing of Macedonia as a Serbian country and of the historic sites and personages of Macedonia as "Serbian" sites and personages. Every child knows of Prilep, Ochrida, Salonica, Kostur and other places in Macedonia. The most popular hero in the whole of Serbian national poetry, Kraljević Marko, hailed from Macedonia. So did King Vukašin, Despot Uglješa, Constantine-Bey, and many others. But we will speak of Macedonia from the point of view of national tradition in another chapter.

The men at the head of affairs in Serbia during the nineteenth century have taken a keen interest—so far as circumstances would allow—in the non-liberated parts of the Serbian nation. Macedonia was looked upon as being the same as any other Serbian country under the foreign yoke. Serbian princes, Ministers of State, councillors and leading men in general sent help from Serbia to Macedonia for the building and repairing

[1] "He also grew to dislike the Macedonians on account of their treachery and want of a real sense of patriotism and honour" ("M. Stambulov," by A. Hulme Beaman, London, 1895, p. 40).

of churches and schools, they subsidized the schoolmasters, contributed school and church books, and so forth. Directly after the liberation of Serbia, Prince Miloš Obrenović presented the Monastery of Lesnovo near Ištip with a bell, and bestowed another upon the Monastery of St. John Bigorski near Debar. His brother Jevrem Obrenović presented one to the Monastery of Treskavac near Prilep, Prince Alexander Karagjorgjević bestowed a similar gift upon the Monastery of St. John Bigorski near Debar, etc.

All Serbian Governments considered it their patriotic duty to admit Serbian children from Macedonia to Serbian schools, and to educate them at the expense of the State. Young men who wished to study for the priesthood or the scholastic profession were especially welcomed.

Serbian science never discriminated between Macedonia and the rest of the Serbian lands. J. Rajić, the first Serbian historian (1726–1801), and P. Solarić, the first Serbian geographer, used broadly to include Serbia with Macedonia. The map of Sava Tekelija, of the year 1805, gives the frontiers of Serbia in great detail. They include, besides Kosovo Plain, Skoplje, Kratovo, and Ćustendil. In Baron Rotkirch's "Geography of Serbia," which was translated into Serbian and the map copied by Stephan Milošević in 1822, we also find Macedonia included in the Serbian frontiers.[1]

In his "Serbian Dictionary" of 1852, which from an ethnographic point of view may be considered a veritable Encyclopædia of that period, Vuk St. Karadžić, the father of Serbian modern literature, speaks of localities in Macedonia as *Serbian*. There we find the Vardar

[1] J. Cvijić, "Srpski Književni Glasnik," xi. (1904), pp. 209–210.

and the Crni Drim and Beli Drim figuring as rivers of Old Serbia, the counties of Gornji Polog and Donji Polog referred to as counties of Old Serbia and Kratovo, Kumanovo and Prilep, etc., as towns of Old Serbia. Concerning some localities Karadžić is more explicit. Thus, for instance, he mentions under *Tetovo* that it is a town in Old Serbia, that the "Turks (Moslems) there speak Turkish and Albanian, and the Christians *Serbian*," and that "round about Tetovo there are villages the inhabitants of which are of the Turkish (Moslem) faith, but speak *Serbian*." Under *Krčava* (Kićevo) we read that it is "a town in the pashalik of Skoplje; that one-third of its inhabitants are Christians, whereas the rest are Turks (Moslems), but that all speak *Serbian*. . . ." Under *Gostivar* we find that "it lies in the district of *Tetovo*," and that "the Turks (Moslems) there speak Turkish and Albanian, and the Christians *Serbian*." Under *Debar* we find mentioned that in 1836 he met two men from Debar in Cetinje who spoke *Serbian*, and that "there are many villages there (in Debar) where the inhabitants speak as they do, and that they are called *Serbs* even as they themselves were said to be."

Leading foreign scholars of the first half of the nineteenth century also considered Macedonia as forming part of Serbian territory. In the maps published in Nuremberg by "Homann Nachfolger" at the beginning of the nineteenth century (1802, 1805, etc.), Serbia not only includes the regions of Kosovo and Novi Pazar, but also Skoplje and Kratovo. On the map by Rotkirch, already referred to, we find the same thing. On the map by Fried, published in Vienna, the frontiers of Serbia are drawn east of Ćustendil. It is the same in

all the better geographical handbooks in which Serbia, although not yet fully liberated from the Turks, is represented. Such examples and evidence might be tripled.[1] Dr. Joseph Müller, who was for many years a surgeon in the Turkish army and knew Serbian, mentions at length where Serbs are to be met with in Macedonia. He mentions them as being found in the counties of Debar, Struga, Ochrida, Resan, Prespa, Bitolj and throughout the whole of Macedonia generally.[2]

Where was the need for Serbia under these circumstances to set on foot a propaganda to bring about the "Serbicization" of Macedonia? What was there that could possibly be Serbicized? In Macedonia, as in all other liberated Serbian countries, the Serbian national consciousness was thoroughly awake. There, too, even as in other Serbian lands, the Serbian tongue was spoken, the Serbian customs were upheld, the Serbian tradition was handed down, and in both church and school the knowledge of Serbian letters as steadfastly guarded. Serbia, small, poor, and still under Turkish suzerainty; Serbia, who had just joined the ranks of European states, left matters in the non-liberated regions to develop naturally and normally. She concentrated all her attention upon her own intellectual, economic, and political progress, so that she might be ready for the moment that would bring the great achievement of the unification of the whole Serbian race.

Towards the Bulgars and their revival in the nineteenth century, Serbia's attitude was most friendly. Serbia herself had but lately been a slave under the

[1] J. Cvijić, "Srpski Književni Glasnik," xi. (1904), pp. 208–212.

[2] Dr. Joseph Müller, "Albanien Rumelien, und die Oesterreich-Montenegrinische Grenze," Prague, 1844.

Turks and a martyr under the Greek clergy. Her kinsmen, too, were still slaves and martyrs in Turkey. Serbia fully understood the position of the Bulgars, and tried to meet them and to help them to the best of her ability. In the State Archives in Belgrade are the records proving that Prince Miloš Obrenović cordially agreed to Panta Hadži Stoilov's proposal that 30,000 Bulgars from the interior of Bulgaria should emigrate to Serbia. The Serbian Government assisted the Bulgars in every way. The first Bulgarian books were printed gratis in the Serbian State printing works. The leading young men of reawakened Bulgaria studied at the expense of the Serbian Government. To such Bulgarian patriots as Rakovski, Karavelov, and many others Serbia not only showed hospitality, but she helped them in their struggle with the Greeks, furnished them with the means of subsistence and intervened on their behalf in the matter of amnesties. Serbia never dreamt that one day Bulgaria's demands would become grasping, extravagant, and hostile to herself.

When the Bulgars began to push their propaganda beyond the limits of their own territory, Serbia woke up and immediately stood upon the defence of Serbian rights. She fully realized her duty towards the Serbs in Turkey, but its fulfilment was fraught with the greatest difficulties. Great indeed were the difficulties in Serbia's way. They were decisive factors in Bulgaria's success in Macedonia.

1. Serbia by her insurrection and emancipation represented the first, and a very shrewd blow at the Turkish Empire in the nineteenth century. For this alone she was already hated in Turkey. Moreover, Serbia had become a centre of attraction for the non-liberated

Serbs. This further increased the feeling of hostility towards her. Finally, the sturdy national consciousness of the Macedonian Serbs roused the suspicion of the Porte and led to the persecution of the Serbs within her borders. The very designation "Serbian" was prohibited. A Serb in Macedonia might officially describe himself as a "rayah" (Christian subject), a Christian, a Greek, or even as a Bulgar, only not as a Serb. Under these conditions every attempt to help the Serbs in Turkey from Serbia was foredoomed to failure.

2. By proclaiming the independence of the Church of free Serbia, Serbia had offended the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople. The latter now viewed Serbia, and all Serbs generally, with mistrust; wherefore it was not favourably inclined towards them and their demands, but intrigued against them all the time.

3. Apart from the sympathy with which the Bulgarians inspired the Russians, there were also Russia's political calculations to be taken into account. The Russian diplomats in Petrograd and Constantinople looked upon Bulgaria as within the sphere of Russian political interests. To put it quite mildly, they reckoned that in free and great Bulgaria they would have a tool for carrying out their policy in the Balkans. The greater this Bulgaria, the stronger would be their support. Wherefore official Russia too assisted the aspirations and propaganda of the Bulgarian patriots with might and main; she furnished them with means and advice and pledged herself to a great Bulgaria.

4. Serbia and Serbian territory were always assumed by Russia—although Serbia herself had never given

any cause for this assumption—to belong to the Austrian sphere of interest in the Balkans. This sphere was to be restricted as much as possible, and so the Russians strove by helping the Bulgars to reduce Serbia and to weaken her.

5. Poor little Serbia, hated by Turkey, having neither the sympathies of the Greek Patriarchate nor Russia's protection, menaced by Austria as her constant enemy, had no material resources at her command to further any propaganda among her kinsmen in Turkey.

All this notwithstanding, Serbia did her best. Already in the reign of Prince Mihajlo, Serbia endeavoured through Russia and through her own representatives in Constantinople to counteract the Bulgarian influence in Macedonia. In view of the fact that the Bulgars were likely to succeed in emancipating themselves from the Greek Patriarchate, and that they were already openly agitating for the inclusion of Macedonia within their sphere, the Serbian Government took the position very seriously.

On March 11, 1868, the then Serbian Minister for Foreign Affairs wrote in a letter to the Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople that "it is the duty of the Serbian Government to see to it that the ancient ecclesiastical prerogatives of that nation, whose head is the Serbian principality, are not infringed by the emancipation of the Bulgarian Church. This duty, which we have never lost sight of, has now been acutely accentuated by the circulars of the Bulgarian leaders, which have been sent also to purely Serbian eparchies. . . . You, Sir, will readily understand that the desire of the Serbian Government to recognize the rights of the Bulgars cannot go so far as to abandon

our own national rights. . . . At one time there were four Patriarchates in the Balkan Peninsula, viz. the Patriarchate of Constantinople for the Greeks, that of Ipek for the Serbs, that of Trnovo for the Bulgars, and that of Ochrida which by right of conquest was sometimes under the Bulgars and sometimes under the Serbs, but finally—and this fact deserves special attention—fell under the Ottoman Empire as a Serbian possession. . . . The Patriarchates of Ipek and Ochrida were not completely abrogated in the latter half of last century, but are to this day referred to in the Constantinople records as being merely annexed to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which now pays the annual tribute to the Imperial Treasury on their behalf. . . . As it is now proposed to detach one of these Patriarchates, called the Bulgarian, from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, nothing else can be meant save what can be honestly implied, namely, the Patriarchate of Trnovo. By the cession of any other Patriarchate to the Bulgarian Church, the question would arise whether an old Serbian possession would not thereby be transferred to such as have no claim to it according to church history, nor yet because of the vested rights of the Serbian nation in the Balkan Peninsula." [1]

The Serbian Government took up exactly the same line. From a letter written by the Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople on April 29, 1869, it may be gathered that his work in Constantinople consisted in endeavouring to obtain that, "by the

[1] J. Ristić, "Spoljni odnošaji Srbje" ("Serbian Foreign Relations"), vol. iii. pp. 296–302; "Kako je postala Bugarska Egzarhija" ("How the Bulgarian Exarchate Arose"), Belgrade, 1897, pp. 24–27.

restoration of the Bulgarian Church, the rights of the Serbian Church should not be violated," "that the Serbian eparchies should continue to remain in touch with the Œcumenical (Greek) Patriarchate," and "that the Patriarchate should appoint Serbian priests for the people." [1]

But all efforts of the Serbian Government were too weak to counteract the greatly superior Russian influence in Constantinople. The Bulgarian Exarchate, finally established in 1870, cut deeply into purely Serbian territory also. The protests of the Serbian Government received no attention.

The independent Church of Serbia was likewise ill-pleased with the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. When in 1870 the Œcumenical Patriarch, anxious to reverse the decision establishing the Bulgarian Exarchate, convoked an Œcumenical Council, so that the question might be solved by the assembled Metropolitans of the Orthodox Church, the Metropolitan of Serbia replied to the Patriarch's invitation that the Porte could only be entitled to approve or confirm the resolution of the Church, but could not by herself solve Church questions except in consultation with the Church. "Consequently her decision possessed no canonical authority with the Church. By the decision of the Porte the Church was greatly exposed to arbitrary action, and her continued existence would be rendered impossible in a country where thoughts, actions, and respect are subject to change, and where the very foundations of security are undermined." [2]

[1] "Kako je postala Bugarska Egzarhija" ("How the Bulgarian Exarchate Arose"), p. 80.

[2] Jovan Ristić, "Spoljni odnošaji" ("Serbian Foreign Relations"), iii. pp. 294–295.

When the Serbian Government saw that its protests were useless, it set itself the task of doing what it could to save the Serbian population from the encroachments of Bulgarian influence. To this end a committee was formed in Belgrade to look after the education and intellectual progress of the Serbs in Turkey and to "lay before the Government a proposal to open schools, and to send teachers, books, and other requirements." Within rather less than five years Serbia succeeded, not without great difficulty, in opening schools in sixty-one localities, over and above the schools which were already founded and kept up by the local population. The principal townships in Macedonia supplied with schools at that time were Kičevo (girls' and boys'), Gostivar, Sveti Jovan Debarski, Banajni (Skoplje district), Bašino Selo, Belovište, Bogumili (district of Veles), Borovac (district of Ochrida), Venčani (Ochrida), Veles (girls' and boys'), Debar (girls' and boys'), Egri Palanka, Zletovo, Klisura, Kočani (girls' and boys'), Kratovo, Kruševo, Kumanovo (girls' and boys'), Kučevište (Skoplje), Lešak (Tetovo), Lešani (Ochrida), Organci (Kičevo), Poreč, (Skoplje), Tetovo (girls' and boys'), Prečista (Kičevo), Čučer (Skoplje). Books were, moreover, supplied to the already existing Serbian schools, congregations, and churches. Bells, icons, and other church furniture were sent to many of the Macedonian churches and monasteries.[1]

Besides these efforts, the Serbian Government did what it could in Constantinople. The Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople let no opportunity

[1] J. Ristić, "Spoljni odnošaji Srbije" ("Serbian Foreign Relations"), iii. pp. 281–283, 284, 290.

slip for "obtaining confirmations of appointments in Old Serbia and Macedonia, of *Serbian* bishops who would be able to resist the Bulgarian tide and to counteract the influence which the Bulgars hoped to exercise in European Turkey." [1]

Serbia's war with Turkey in 1876 was fraught with disastrous consequences for the Serbian schools in Turkey. The Serbian name, already sufficiently feared in Turkey since the creation of free Serbia, was now loathed worse than before. All the Serbian churches were closed, the Serbian teachers expelled, and the Serbian books burnt. All this the Bulgars contrived to turn to good account.

Serbia was, of course, unable to resume her work in Macedonia directly after the war. Enlarged by the war at the expense of Turkish territory, raised from the position of a Turkish vassal to that of an independent principality and subsequently to that of a kingdom, it was natural that she should become, more than ever, Turkey's *bête noire*. Moreover, Serbia was too exhausted by two costly wars to provide further resources for the moment. Not until 1885 did conditions somewhat improve. In this year the Bulgars, in defiance of the treaty of Berlin, annexed Roumelia. It was already clear, moreover, to the whole world that the Bulgars would not stop there. The people of Macedonia became alarmed lest they, too, should become the prey of Bulgaria, and began to petition the Turkish authorities for as many more Serbian schools as possible, and to ask Serbia for stronger support. Turkey, too, could now see through Bulgaria's intentions, and so became

[1] Letter from the Serbian diplomatic representative in Constantinople, December 6, 1872 ("Kako je postala Bugarska Egzarhija" ("How the Bulgarian Exarchate Arose," p. 68).

somewhat more liberally disposed towards the Serbs in Macedonia. By private initiative the Society of St. Sava was founded in Belgrade in 1886 with the object of helping to preserve and educate the Serbian people in Turkish territory. The funds of the Society multiplied rapidly, chiefly owing to contributions from Serbs in the non-liberated countries. In 1887 Serbia prevailed upon the Porte to permit her the establishment of Serbian Consulates in Salonica and Skoplje. In this way the opening of national schools was greatly facilitated for the Serbian inhabitants. From that time the number of Serbian schools in Turkey began to increase. In 1891 there were 117 Serbian schools with an aggregate staff of 140 teachers open in the vilayets of Kosovo, Bitolj, and Salonica; in 1896 there were 159 schools with an aggregate of 240 teachers; in 1901 there were 226 elementary schools, four lycées (boys' high schools), one theological college, and three high schools for girls. Subsequently to 1900 there were over 300 Serbian schools in Turkish territory.

In this way the preservation of the Serbian nationality in Turkey—which was begun earlier—was supported by the Serbian Government as far as circumstances would permit. Moreover, the Government assisted as far as possible the educational and intellectual labours of the Serbs in Turkey by defraying the printing expenses of Serbian books in Constantinople (which had been done since 1886) and by the publication of the "Carigradski Glasnik" (since 1893) and the "Vardar" (in Skoplje, 1908).

The Serbian Church question in Turkey could not be mooted for a long time. The Greek Patriarchate was ill disposed towards the Serbs; Russia was helping

Bulgaria to the prejudice of Serbia; Turkey feared the Serbian people. Finally, when the demands of the Macedonian Serbs for Serbian bishops and priests could no longer be refused, the Serbian Government acted as mediator through its diplomatic representatives. In 1896 a Serb was appointed Bishop of Skoplje and later on, again thanks to Serbia's mediation, a Serb was appointed Bishop of Veles-Debar.

Serbia has never ceased to do what she could for her land of Macedonia. If she did not succeed in finally breaking up the Bulgarian propaganda, it was because the circumstances responsible for her failure were all the time too strong for her.

Finally, Serbia did for Macedonia the utmost that could be required of her. She wrested Macedonia from Turkey at the cost of torrents of blood; she defended her against Bulgaria, and to-day Serbia is sacrificing the best of her sons for the liberation of Macedonia.

No; Serbia has indeed and to the very end fulfilled her duty towards Macedonia.

* * * * *

The Macedonians on their part have never ceased from being good Serbs and from working for union with Serbia.

We have said already that when the Macedonians fought for the creation of free Serbia they did so in the hope that freedom would come to them also from her. Therefore they laboured for her establishment either as good citizens of Serbia or as champions of her enlargement. They gave expression to their Serbian feeling in Macedonia as well.

Before the advent of the nineteenth-century schools were scarce under the Turkish rule. Such schools as

existed were mostly in monasteries, and in them young men were trained for the priesthood or the cloister. We have already mentioned a school of this type as existing in Macedonia in 1780. There was a Serbian monastic school in the Monastery of Treskavac in existence until 1780.[1] There were similar schools in Lesnovo, Slepče, and other Macedonian monasteries. These schools were the last relics of Old Serbian civilization and letters, and they were maintained by the people without help from abroad. The first urban schools in Macedonia were founded in the nineteenth century. The first of these were opened in Prilep and Kučeviste (Skoplje) as early as 1813; in Varoš, near Prilep, in 1820, and in Skoplje in 1830 and 1835. After that date the Serbian schools in Macedonia increased in number. Towards the middle of the nineteenth century there were already thirty. But this number was still insufficient, and the people urgently demanded more. The latter half of the nineteenth century brought the Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia and the opening of Bulgarian schools. But this did not stop the progress of the Serbian schools.[2]

They were opened all over the country—in Kostur, Florina, Sveti Jovan Melnički, Petrič, Razlog, Banjska, Bitolj, Resan, Struga, Smiljevo, Debar, Galičnik, Radovište, Ochrida, etc. All these schools were opened by the Serbs of Macedonia on their own initiative and maintained at their own expense or with the revenues of church endowments. The curriculum and the books used in these schools were Serbian. They were never

[1] J. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep i njegova okolina" ("Prilep and its Environs"), p. 109.

[2] The Bulgarian school in Skoplje was opened in 1863; that in Veles in 1872, that in Tetovo in 1876, and that in Kičevo in 1877.

called anything but *Serbian* or *Slavo-Serbian* schools, and their teachers, *Serbian* teachers. Some of these schoolmasters, although not great scholars, distinguished themselves by their zeal and even by their literary efforts. One of the most distinguished among them was Jordan Hadži Konstantinović, a native of Veles, who was accused of rebellion and banished to Asia, simply because he openly resisted the abuses practised by the Greek priests. He wrote school books and printed them in Serbia. He used to collect old Serbian books and MSS. and send them to Serbia. He also tried his hand at scientific research. The journal of the Serbian Scientific Society, the Serbian Academy of those days, published several contributions from his pen on the history of Macedonia.[1]

In 1876 the Turks closed all the Serbian schools in Macedonia, and expelled all the Serbian teachers, because of the war between Serbia and Turkey. But as soon as conditions improved, the Macedonians appealed to the Turkish Government for greater freedom from the Bulgars and for as many Serbian schools as possible. As, owing to the Bulgarian intrigues with the Turkish authorities, it was difficult to obtain permission for the opening of Serbian schools, and as the latter were exposed to Bulgarian raids and attacks as soon as they were open, the people also took to opening and maintaining schools without the special permission of the Turkish authorities or the knowledge of the Bulgarian propagandists. In this way many so-called "secret Serbian schools" were opened all over the country.

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. vii. pp. 170–177, and vol. viii. pp. 130–150.

Finally, when Serbian education had fairly taken hold in Macedonia, the Macedonians began to publish the newspapers already referred to, one in Constantinople (1893) and one in Skoplje (1908). The editor of the former came from Ochrida, and the editor of the latter was a native of Skoplje. The Serbian calendar "Golub" was published annually in Constantinople and enjoyed a wide circulation.

So far as the Turkish censorship would allow it, Serbian books were sold in the bookshops of Salonica, Skoplje, Bitolj, Ochrida, Prilep, Seres, Kostur, Voden, Gevgelija, Veles, and other Macedonian towns. All the booksellers were Serbs of the country.

In short—in spite of the Bulgarian propaganda, and in spite of Turkish intimidation—the Macedonian Serbs zealously guarded their national education.

It was impossible, as we have seen, to broach the Serbian Church question. Until the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the Macedonians followed Russia's advice in supporting the Bulgars, hoping that with the solution of the Bulgarian Church question their own question would be solved also. But when the newly established Exarchate opened its campaign of Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia, the Macedonians soon realized whither all this was leading. In 1872 the Bulgars received the two bishops already referred to, in Skoplje and Ochrida, who inaugurated a vast propaganda and fanatical persecutions of the Serbian element, schools, and education. The people were roused and began to retaliate and defend themselves. Finally, in 1874, the Serbian population throughout Macedonia, in the eparchies of Samokov, Ćustendil, Veles, Debar, Melnik, Ochrida, and Seres, addressed a petition to the Sultan

and the Greek Patriarchate to restore the suppressed Patriarchate of Ipek and to include them within its jurisdiction. "We are Serbs, and not Bulgars," ran these petitions; "the Exarchate would Bulgarize us, and this we do not desire, and therefore appeal to you to save us from this calamity and to restore to us our independent Serbian Church." Nobody knows what the Sultan and the Patriarch did with these petitions. In 1876 war broke out between Serbia and Turkey, and nothing came of the wish of the Macedonian Serbs.

Handicapped by Greek intrigue, and by the reinforced Bulgarian propaganda after the creation of the Bulgarian State, the Serbian Church question in Macedonia could not be reopened for a long time. The people forwarded petitions and sent delegates to appeal to the Sultan and the Patriarch for the restoration of the Serbian Church, but always without success. Finally the Serbian Government intervened through its Ministers in Constantinople in this matter also. The Patriarchs had promised, one after another, that they would improve the position of the Serbian Church in Turkey, but the promise was never kept. Nor was the other positive undertaking fulfilled that upon the death of the Greek Metropolitan Metodije, a Serb was to be appointed Bishop of Skoplje. The populace became uneasy and sent a deputation to Constantinople. At last, after great efforts on behalf of the national cause, the Holy Synod of the Greek Patriarchate in Constantinople on August 30, 1897, appointed the Serb Firmilijan Dražić ecclesiastical administrator of the Bishopric of Skoplje. Although this was but a very small success, the people saw that they had gained something by it. Firmilijan was

enthusiastically welcomed by the populace of Skoplje and the surrounding country. Upon repeated petitions from the Macedonians, Firmilijan was in 1899 appointed Metropolitan of the Eparchy of Skoplje, but his ordination was delayed by Bulgarian intrigue and did not take place until St. Vitus' Day (June 15/28), 1902.

After surmounting similar difficulties the Macedonian Serbs finally procured the appointment of a Serb as Metropolitan of the Eparchy of Veles-Debar.

But the Serbian feeling of the Macedonians in the nineteenth century did not confine itself to efforts to maintain and strengthen the Serbian Church and schools in Macedonia. It comes out even more strongly in the sacrifices made by the Macedonians for the sake of union with Serbia. When Serbia was at war with Turkey in 1876, the Serbian army included large numbers of volunteers from Macedonia who had joined its ranks in order to help Serbia in her purpose of freeing Macedonia. Nor was this all. No sooner had the Serbian army begun to advance towards Macedonia in 1877 and 1878, than a vigorous answering movement in favour of Serbia made itself felt among the populace. In the regions where the arrival of the Serbian army was imminently expected, real risings took place in the Serbian cause. The most serious of these was the rising in the counties of Kumanovo, Kriva Palanka, and Kratovo. It was headed by the chief men of the district. Leading citizens of Kumanovo swore in church upon the Gospel that they would strive to the end in the cause of Serbia. In the appeals addressed by the insurgents to the then Prince of Serbia, Milan Obrenović, they protested their devotion and loyalty to him, imploring him to espouse the cause of the insurgents

and to strive with all his might to obtain the union of their country with Serbia. The insurgents also applied to the generals then in command of the Serbian army, begging them to supply them secretly with arms and ammunition.

This Macedonian movement on behalf of Serbia the Turks suppressed with fire and sword. Several of the insurgent leaders succeeded in escaping to Serbia. They settled in the depopulated districts of the counties of Toplica and Vranja, where large numbers of these refugees live even to this day. A terrible vengeance descended upon the heads of the captured leaders and the populace which had remained behind. For a long time the appellation "Serbian" was prohibited. But the memories of the Serbo-Turkish war of 1876–1878, and of the Macedonian rising for union with Serbia, lived on in the hearts of the nation. To this day the war and the insurrection are commemorated by the Macedonians in their poetry.[1]

Not even these disasters deterred the Macedonians from thoughts of liberation and union with Serbia. In 1880 sixty-five of the most notable men of the districts of Kumanovo, Kriva Palanka, Kočane, Ištip, Veles, Prilep, Bitolj, Ochrida, Kičevo, and Skoplje addressed an appeal to M.S. Milojević, the Serbian commander of the Macedonian volunteers in the war of 1876–1878

[1] The ballad of the Serbian Prince Milan Obrenović and Sulejman Pasha, which was composed by the native poets of Kumanovo, was subsequently published by the Bulgarian professor P. Draganov in 1894 (P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-slavjanski sbornik" ["Slavo-Macedonian Collection"], i., Petrograd, 1894, No. 172), and the ballad on the Macedonian insurrection was published by J. H. Vasiljević in 1906 (J. H. Vasiljević, "Ustanak Srba u Kumanovskoj Palanackoj Kazi u 1878" ["Insurrection of Serbs in the Kumanovo and Palanka Districts, 1878"], Belgrade, 1906, pp. 57–58).

against Turkey, begging him to contrive somehow to smuggle arms through to them and to lead them, and they would rise in insurrection. That same year saw the outbreak of the so-called "Brsjačka buna" (revolt of the Brsjaci—an ancient tribal name) among the population of the counties of Kičevo, Poreč, Bitolj, and Prilep. The revolt extended over six months, and ended in failure.

All these revolts serve to illustrate the Serbian feeling of the Macedonian population. These revolts were planned in the Serbian cause, and they bore a Serbian character. Unfortunately they have not only been unsuccessful, but their results were disastrous to the Macedonians. In consequence of these revolts the Serbian element was increasingly persecuted, and the Bulgarian increasingly favoured.

Nor was this all. When the Great Bulgaria of San Stefano was announced, all Macedonia was in terror lest it should be placed under Bulgaria. The entire population of the counties of Kumanovo, Skoplje, Palanka, Kratovo, Ćustendil, Kočani, Strumica, Ištip, Veles, Debar, Kičevo, and Prilep sent deputations and appeals to Milan, the then Prince of Serbia, imploring him not to abandon Macedonia to the Bulgars but to intervene so that Macedonia might be assigned to Serbia. When the Congress of Berlin met, petitions with numerous signatures appended to them arrived from all parts of Macedonia, reinforcing by cogent argument the statement that the population of Macedonia is Serbian, and that it does not wish to belong to any country but Serbia. "As Serbs of true and pure stock, of the purest and most intrinsically Serbian country"—so these petitions are worded—"we for the

last time implore on our knees . . . that we may in some manner and by some means be freed from the slavery of five centuries, and united with our country, the principality of Serbia, and that the tears of blood of the Serbian martyrs may be stanched so that they, too, may become useful members of the European community of nations and of the Christian world;" we do not desire "to exchange the harsh Turkish slavery for the vastly harsher and blacker Bulgarian slavery, which will be worse and more intolerable than that of the Turks which we are at present enduring, and will compel us in the end either to slay all our own people, or to abandon our country, to abandon our holy places, and graves, and all that we hold dear. . . ." (see Supplement No. IV).

In the end the Macedonians took up arms to defend themselves against the Bulgars. When in the eighties of last century the Bulgars realized that with all their propaganda they would never succeed in eradicating the Serbian feeling of the Macedonians, they resorted to violence of the most outrageous kind. This was the terrible comitadji campaign in Macedonia, to which we have already alluded. Faced by this bloody terror of the Bulgars, the people took up arms in self-defence. Although they had neither arms nor ammunition, they formed bands to resist the intruders. The leading men of Macedonia placed themselves at the head of the populace. Men like Jovan Dovezenski from the Dovezence Žeglihovo district (Kumanovo), George Skopljanče of Skoplje, Grigor Sokolović of Nebregovo (Prilep), Jovan Babunski of Babuna (Babuna district), and many others were celebrated and commemorated in song as the leaders and heroes of the national defence against the

Bulgars in Macedonia. Under the most desperate conditions, persecuted alike by Bulgarian bands and the Turkish authorities, these defenders of the Serbian name in Macedonia kept up their courage only by their own love and sympathy for the conscious national attitude of the Serbian population of Macedonia. The labours of these men were not without success. They helped to preserve at least that third part of the people of Macedonia which had refused to join the Bulgarian Exarchate, and which has remained Serbian to this day. Had they had more resources at their disposal, they might perhaps have cleared Macedonia of the intruders. A confidential report to the Bulgarian Government by a Bulgarian consular official states that the Serbs had no more than "sixteen bands of one hundred and sixty to one hundred and seventy men," working against the Bulgars, but that nevertheless "the successes of the Serbian element in the vilayet of Bitolj are considerable," and that "in Salonica their position is fairly good." [1]

* * * * *

From what we have said it is surely clear that Serbia did all she could to the limit of her strength to save Macedonia from Bulgarian intrusion and Bulgarization. It is also likewise clear the Macedonian people made every effort to preserve its Serbian character and to become united with Serbia. Unfortunately adverse circumstance was too strong for both Serbia and the Serbs of Macedonia. Serbia was not strong enough to fight Turkey and the abuses of the Greek Church, to oppose the will of Russia and to repel the Bulgarian propaganda

[1] "Le Brigandage en Macédoine, un rapport confidentiel au gouvernement bulgare," Berlin, 1908, p. 41.

and the armed terror of the comitadji. This, and this only, is the reason why a large part of the population finally, after an heroic struggle, great trials, and enormous sacrifices, was nevertheless compelled actually to call itself Bulgarian.

The Bulgarian success is, however, only relative. Only the population of the larger towns in Macedonia, whence started the Bulgarian agitation under the protection of Russian diplomacy, adhered to the Exarchate.[1] The villages did not all respond equally to the Bulgarian appeal. According to the figures compiled after several years of investigation by Rostovski, Russian Consul in Botolj, there were in the vilayet of Bitolj 186,656 Serbs who joined the Bulgarian Exarchate, and 93,694 who remained faithful to the Patriarchate. One-half of the Christians in their region did not join the Bulgars. In the Eparchy of Skoplje 20,000 families belonged to the Exarchate, and 10,000 belonged to the Patriarchate. Here, too, the numerical proportion is the same. Besides this there were some parts of Macedonia where the Exarchate had no success at all. The whole of Skoplje Crna Gora, with only a few exceptions, and many villages north of it remained faithful to the Patriarchate. The villages in Poreč between Tetovo and Bitolj kept themselves completely outside the Bulgarian influence. Moreover, there is a large proportion of the Serbian population throughout Macedonia which has remained Serbian. Round Strumica, Drama, and Serez in Southern Macedonia there are many Serbs who, unable to call themselves Turks, and not desirous of calling themselves Bulgars,

[1] St. Novaković, "Balkanska Pitanja" ("The Balkan Questions"), 1906, p. 118.

call themselves Greek, although they speak only Serbian.

An example will show how strong the Serbian feeling is in Macedonia despite the fierce trials through which it has passed. Already in the early days of the open struggle against the Greeks, the Serbian priest Jovan Burković in Skoplje distinguished himself especially in his opposition to them. For this the Greek Mètropolitan excommunicated him and caused his books to be thrown out of the church. In spite of this ill-usage neither he nor his flock ever joined the Bulgarian movement. Neither Bulgarian intimidation and blackmail nor Greek persecution could drive him away from the Patriarchate. He hated it, but he could not deny his Serbian feeling and call himself a Bulgar. To the day of his death he and his parishioners adhered to the hated Patriarchate and remained Serbs. In his old age, and when his health was already failing, Jovan Burković prayed that God might grant him but one wish—to live to conduct the service at the opening of the Serbian Lycée, which was at that time being founded in Skoplje. He was spared to see the fulfilment of his wish.[1]

Macedonia is full of Serbian individuals who have survived all crises and trials and remained Serbs. And there are yet more who are prepared to cry out as soon as they are delivered from the Bulgarian danger: "We were, and we will be Serbs."

[1] St. Novaković, "Balkanska Pitanja" ("The Balkan Questions"), pp. 89–90.

XI

MACEDONIAN DIALECTS OF THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE

Language of the Macedonian Slavs originally merely called "Slav"—No mention of Bulgarian language in Macedonia up to the beginning of the nineteenth century—Language of literary records in Macedonia Serbian throughout the Middle Ages—Serbian also in the nineteenth century until the advent of the Bulgarian propaganda—Difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian languages noticed at a very early date—Macedonian idiom not identical in all districts—Insufficiency of linguistic material for thorough study of Macedonian idiom—All Macedonian dialects belong to one type—Macedonian dialects are Serbian—Morphology—Etymology—The article as it appears in Macedonian dialects is not a Bulgarian characteristic

WE have already mentioned in another connection that Professor Djerić, after a thorough study of all records referring to Macedonia, established the fact that the language of the Macedonian Slavs was originally simply called *Slav*, even as the people who spoke that language were called *Slavs*. This term is also applied to the Macedonian tongue into which Cyril and Method and their disciples translated the Holy Scriptures in the first centuries of Christendom among the Balkan Slavs. Professor Djerić, moreover, carefully investigated all historic sources in which the language of the Macedonian Slav of the period is mentioned, right up to the twelfth century, and nowhere did he find the language

called otherwise than the Slav.[1] Of the Bulgarian language in Macedonia there is at that time no trace, although it was the time of the longest period of the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia. Finally, Professor Djerić studied all records which refer to Macedonia, and upon this evidence has established that "from the earliest times right up to the beginning of the nineteenth century there is not one reliable instance to prove that the Macedonians ever called themselves Bulgars or their language the "Bulgarian."[2]

All literary records produced in Macedonia during the Middle Ages are composed solely in Serbian. Already in 1844, V. Grigorovič, in his travels through Macedonia, took note of a host of Serbian literary records. The MSS. Catalogue of the National Library in Sofia (1910) contains twenty-five MSS. from Macedonia. Twenty-two out of the twenty-five are Serbian (from Skoplje, Veles, Ištip, Strumica, Debar, Prilep, Ochrida), as the author of the catalogue, the Bulgarian Professor Coneff himself admits, and only three are non-Serbian. Of these three, two are Serbo-Bulgarian, and only one is Bulgarian.[3] This last-named could only be the work of a Bulgar who had come by chance to Macedonia. All marginal notes, legends attached to pictures and inscriptions found in churches, etc., in Macedonia are purely Serbian. In many of them the language is referred to as Serbian. In 1466, Archbishop Marko of Ochrida ordered the "Canon of the Great Church" (Zakonik Velike Crkve) in Ochrida to be translated into

[1] V. Djerić, "O srpskom imenu u Staroj Srbiji i Makedoniji" ("The term 'Serbian' in Old Serbia and Macedonia"), Belgrade, 1904, pp. 82–88.

[2] Ibid., p. 42.

[3] P. Popović, "Serbian Macedonia," London, 1916, p. 4.

Serbian.[1] In a seventeenth-century Macedonian MS. containing the sermons of Damaskin Studita it so happens that a word is defined, and in order to make its meaning clear, we are told what it signifies "in the Serbian (i.e. Macedonian) language."[2]

In the nineteenth century and up to the advent of the Bulgarian propaganda the language spoken in Macedonia is called "Serbian." In his "Srpski Rječnik" (Serbian dictionary) Vuk S. Karadžić speaks of the language of the Macedonians as "*Serbian.*" As we have already stated elsewhere, he mentions "that in Tetovo the Turks speak Turkish and Albanian, and the Christians *Serbian*"; that "around Tetovo there are villages whose inhabitants profess the Turkish faith, but speak *Serbian*; that in Kičevo (Krčava) "about one-third of the inhabitants are Christians, and the rest profess the Turkish faith, but that all of them speak *Serbian*"; that in Gostivar "the Turks speak Turkish and Albanian, and the Christians *Serbian*"; that in 1836 he met two men from Debar in Cetinje who spoke *Serbian*, and that "in that locality (around Debar) there are many villages where the inhabitants have the same speech as these two men, and that they call themselves Serbs."

The difference between the Macedonian and Bulgarian languages has been noticed long ago by scholars. Already in 1844 V. Grigorovič drew attention to the striking difference between the Macedonian and Bulgarian languages,[3] and was only prevented by his

[1] Lj. Stojanović, "Stari Srpski Zapisi i Natpisi" ("Old Serbian Inscriptions and Notes"), No. 328.

[2] V. Djerić, "O srpskom imenu u Staroj Srbiji i Makedoniji" ("The term 'Serbian' in Old Serbia and Macedonia"), p. 27.

[3] V. Grigorovič, "Očerk putešestvija," p. 194.

partiality for the Bulgars from applying the term "Serbian" to the language spoken in Macedonia. In 1872 a Bulgar, Prvanov by name, published "Alphabet Books" (Bukvars) for use in the Bulgarian schools in Macedonia, and specially stated in these books that his object in so doing was, that "our Macedonian brothers may lose the habit of the Serbian pronunciation of the Bulgarian speech."[1] Djordje M. Puljevski, a native of Galičnik in Macedonia, wrote in 1875 that the inhabitants of those parts did not understand Bulgarian.[2] P. Draganov, Bulgarian Professor in Salonica, mentioned in 1894 that the Macedonians experienced great difficulty in learning the modern Bulgarian idiom.[3] How great is the difference between the Bulgarian language and the various Macedonian dialects is best seen by the fact that Macedonian children are unable to study at the Bulgarian Lycée without having previously learnt Bulgarian. The Bulgarian Lycée in Skoplje had a preparatory class attached, where Macedonian children, after having attended the Bulgarian elementary schools, still had to study Bulgarian for at least six months to enable them to follow the lessons at the Lycée.[4] A preliminary study of Serbian was not necessary for students at the Serbian Lycée in Skoplje.

The language spoken in Macedonia is not everywhere the same, but is divided into several dialects. To establish correctly the areas over which these dialects are

[1] P. Draganov, "Izvestija S.P. Slavjanskago Blagotvoritelnago Obštestva," 1888, quoted in "Macedonia" by St. Protić, p. 13.

[2] Djordje M. Puljevski, "Rečnik od tri Jezika," Belgrade, 1875, p. 1.

[3] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-slavjanski sbornik," i., Petrograd, 1894, p. iv.

[4] Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, "Naselja srpskik zemalja" ("Settlements of the Serbian Lands"), vol. iii. p. 508.

spoken, and to give a detailed definition of their distinguishing features is quite impossible at the present moment. The greatest difficulty lies in the fact that not enough reliable linguistic material has been collected so far. There are districts in Macedonia concerning which there is no philological material of any kind. The bulk of the collected linguistic material is to be found in the traditional lore of the Macedonians, especially in the national ballads. On the other hand, this material has not always been compiled by reliable collectors. Most of the national ballads from Macedonia have been collected by Bulgars; but the ballads so collected do not correctly represent the Macedonian idiom. There are many reasons for this. For one thing, these collectors were unlettered Bulgarian priests, teachers, and agents, unacquainted with the Macedonian dialects, and too ignorant to establish their various characteristics. For another, it was necessary for the Bulgars to publish the Macedonian ballads as quickly as possible and to proclaim them to be Bulgarian, and so the collections were made too hurriedly and without sufficient attention to linguistic refinement of detail. Thirdly, all Bulgarian ballad-collectors were merely agents for Great Bulgarian aspirations whose chief aim it was to exhibit as many Bulgarian characteristics as possible in the Macedonian language, and so they introduced these even in cases where they were obviously quite out of place. Finally, the speech of the Macedonians has been sadly corrupted by Bulgarian propaganda and Bulgarian schools. The purest idiom in Macedonia is spoken by the Serbs of Mahommedan faith, whom—for religious reasons—the Bulgarian propaganda could not influence. In the meantime, however, no

special attention was drawn to their language. It follows therefore from what we have said, that all that has been written by philologists—especially Bulgarian philologists—on the language of the Macedonians, and based upon the philological and linguistic material collected by the Bulgars, cannot be either correct or reliable. Scientific investigation of the language of the Macedonians based on other material has been very limited in extent and embraces only an insignificantly small part of Macedonia. For these reasons, too, we find it difficult to give a detailed philological study of the Serbian dialects in Macedonia, and we must confine ourselves to pointing out their principal features. They plainly exhibit only Serbian, and not Bulgarian characteristics as well.

All Macedonian dialects, no matter how great the difference between them, belong to one type, and all of them by their characteristics are branches of the Serbian language.

The main features which on the one hand link the Macedonian dialects with the Serbian language, and on the other hand distinguish them from the Bulgarian, are (*a*) the permutation of Old Slav individual sounds (Morphology) and (*b*) the rules governing the inflection of words (Etymology).

1. Morphology.

The Old Slav vowel Ѫ (jus), pronounced like the nasal *on*, has in Bulgarian been replaced by the mute Ъ ("dark," jer). In Serbian it has been replaced by the clear *u*, and in the Macedonian dialects likewise by the clear sounds *u*, *a*, *o*.[1] The tendency of Bulgarian is to *darken*

[1] *Examples:* Old Slav *pѫtь*, *rѫka* = Bulgarian *pът*, *rъka* = Serbian *put*, *ruka* = Macedonian *put*, *pat*, *pot*, *ruka*, *raka*, *roka*,

the vowels, that of the Serbian and Macedonian dialects to pronounce them clearly. Whether the clear vowels, which moreover include *u*, of the Macedonian dialects approach more nearly to the Serbian clear *u*, or to the Bulgarian dark vowel ъ, is surely not difficult to decide.

The Old Slav sound group *lъ* has in Bulgarian been replaced by *ъl*, and in Serbian and Macedonian by *u*.[1]

The Old Slav sound group *čьr* is in Bulgarian replaced by *čer*, and in Serbian and Macedonian by *cr*.[2]

In the opinion of philologists the most important permutation of Old Slav sounds in the Serbian and Bulgarian languages is the permutation of the composite sounds *žd* and *št*. Some philologists have gone so far as to classify all the Slav languages into groups according to the permutation of this Old Slav sound group. According to this classification the Serbian language and the Macedonian dialects would unquestionably belong to the same group, because in Bulgarian the *žd* and *št* have remained the same as in Old Slav, whereas in Macedonian and Serbian they appear permuted into *dj* and *ć*. Already in 1835 the first Bulgarian grammarian, Neofit Rilski, observed that the appearance of the *dj* and *ć* in the Macedonian dialects was a

[1] *Examples:* The Old Slav words *vlъkъ*, *plъnъ*. *Blъgarinъ* = Bulgarian *vъlkъ*, *pъlnъ*, *Bъlgarinъ* = Serbian and Macedonian *vuk pun*, *Bugarin*. Owing to the permutation of the vowels *lъ* the Macedonians, when they happen to call themselves Bulgars, always employ the Serbian word *Bugari*, and never the Bulgarian word *Bъlgari*. This peculiarity was observed in 1844 by the Russian scientist V. Grigorovič ("Očerk putešestvija," p. 196). Since then this observation has been repeated by many authors, among them several Bulgars.

[2] *Examples:* The Old Slav words *čьrnъ*, *čьrvenъ* = Bulgarian *čern*, *červen* = Serbian and Macedonian *crn*, *crven*.

Serbian feature.[1] There are many examples of the occurrence of *dj* and *ć* in the Macedonian dialects. In his book "Ogledalo" ("The Mirror") which appeared in 1816, and is written throughout in the Macedonian dialect, Cyril Pejčinović of Tetovo, a monk of the Serbian Monastery of St. Dimitrius near Skoplje, true to the usage of his day, invariably for both groups uses the Serbian *ć* and never the Bulgarian *žd* and *št*. When Vuk Karadžić brought out the national ballads from Macedonia in 1822, he employed the *dj* and *ć* quite correctly in their proper places. In 1875 Dj. M. Puljevski of Galičnik in Macedonia compiled his "Rečnik od tri jezika" (Dictionary of three languages, viz. Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish) for his countrymen. Puljevski was not a great scholar, and in writing was guided by feeling alone. But he, too, regularly uses the *dj* and *ć* sounds. The Bulgarian P. Draganov, who held a post as professor at the Bulgarian Lycée in Salonica, asserts that the *dj* and *ć* sounds are an intrinsic feature of the Macedonian dialects.

In view of the importance of the permutation of the Old Slav composite sounds *žd* and *št* in its bearing upon the question of the Macedonian dialects, St. Novaković, President of the Royal Serbian Academy, wrote an extensive monograph on the subject.[2] For his linguistic material he drew upon the earlier writers who wrote in Macedonian dialects; upon the collections of national ballads compiled in

[1] "Bolgarska Gramatoka," Kragujevac, 1835, pp. 180–181.

[2] "*Dj* and *ć* in the Macedonian National Dialects" ("Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," xii., Belgrade, 1889); "Ein Beitrag zur Kunde der Macedonischen Dialekte" ("Archiv für Slavische Philologie, lxii., 1890, p. 78).

Macedonia by the Bulgars and their friends;[1] the collection by I. S. Jastrebov,[2] and finally upon the folk-tales related to him in the Macedonian dialect of the country around Prilep by P. Kondović, a pupil at the Bulgarian Lycée who had at that time not yet studied the Serbian literary language. In all this linguistic material from Macedonia, Novaković invariably found the Serbian *dj* and *ć* wherever they ought to occur according to rule.[3]

2. Etymology.

In Bulgarian the nouns and adjectives are not inflected at all; they always retain the same form. The cases are expressed by prepositions placed before the nominative. In the Macedonian dialects, as in Serbian, both nouns and adjectives have seven cases, which are formed by added terminations.[4]

[1] St. I. Verković, "Narodne Pesme Makedonskih Bugara, 1860"; The Brothers Dimitrije and Konstantin Miladinovci, "Bugarske narodne pesme," 1861; "Periodičeskoe Spisanie" of the Bulgarian Literary Society.

[2] I. S. Jastrebov, "Običaj'i pjesni Tureckih Serbov," Petrograd, 1886.

[3] *Examples*: Bulgarian words *vežda*, *čužd*= Serbian and Macedonian *vedja*, *tudj*; Bulgarian *svešta*, *srešta*, *kъšta* = Serbian and Macedonian *sveća*, *sreća*, *kuća*.

[4] Examples taken from a Macedonian MS. Collection of the eighteenth century ("Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," xxi. p. 12):—

Genitive: ot *vraga*, radi *bolesti*, *Gospoda*, *hrišćanske vere*, *prestola Božija*.
Dative: *vragu*, *Bogu*, *proroku*, *duhovniku*.
Accusative: *veru hristijansku*, *krasotu*, *prevaru*, *Boga*.
Vocative: *vraže lukavi*, *prelaštena ženo*.
Ablative: *Svetim krštenjem*, *s djavolom*, *s velikim kanunom*, *dušom i telom*.
Locative: na *strašnom sudu*, *prema milosti*, prema *velikom vetru*, na *smrti*.

There is no infinitive of the verb in Bulgarian, but there is both in Serbian and in the Macedonian dialects.[1]

There is no present participle of the verb in Bulgarian, whereas it exists both in Serbian and in the Macedonian dialects.[2]

Examples taken from Macedonian national poetry collected by Bulgars:

Genitive: Telal viče ot *utra* do *mraka*,
Do tri furni *vruća leba*.

Dative: Turčin *Kalinki* dumaše
Devojka se *Bogu* pomolila
Svekru bela košulja.

Accusative: Možeš li *konja* da igraš
Tebe *stara* će zagubat.
Imala majka, imala
Jednoga sina Stojana.

Vocative: *Stojane, sinko rodjene*.
Tatko će rečem, *ćerko* ne velit. . . .
Braća će rečem, *sestro* ne velet.
Naverzi mi, *Rado*, kiten bel testemel.

Ablative: Udari ga čizma i *mamuzom*.
Pod *Beligradom*.
Djul, devojko, pod *djulom* zaspalo.

Locative: Na *kući* slava, vo *kući* slava.
Da se sutra na *divanu* nadje.

[1] Examples from the eighteenth-century Macedonian MSS. Collection:—

biti, gledati, izgovoriti, krstiti se, ostati, oprostiti, pričestiti, pokajati, umoriti, uzeti, činiti, postignuti, osuditi, lagati, govoriti, etc. ("Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," xxxi. p. 13).

Examples from Macedonian national poetry:—

"*Navest*" ću ti, Pejo, kako ćes go "*nosi*,"
"*Osvojit*" ću ravnu Arbaniju.

[2] Examples from the eighteenth-century Macedonian MSS. Collection:—

činećći, gledaćći, znaćći, etc.

Examples from Macedonian National poetry:—

Mene bolan, sestro, *gledaćći*,
Ili dvorje, sestro, *meteećći*,
Ušte taka *zboruećći*,
Ruse kose *pleteećći*.

Some of the tenses (present, imperfect, aorist, future) of the verbs are not formed in the same way in Bulgarian as in Serbian and the Macedonian dialects.

The *accent* is practically the same in Serbian as in the Macedonian dialects, whereas in Bulgarian it is quite different.

The vocabulary of the Serbian language and the Macedonian dialects is the same, the Bulgarian vocabulary is quite different.

Finally we must mention one linguistic feature which is, to all outward appearance, common to the Bulgarian language and to the Macedonian dialects and which does not exist in Serbian. This is the *article*, which is placed *after* the noun both in Bulgarian and in the Macedonian dialects (suffix, post-position of the article). It is interesting from the point of view of Indo-European philology, that among the Balkan languages the article exists only in the Albanian, Bulgarian, and Roumanian languages. Among the Serbian dialects the Macedonian alone possess it. For these reasons the Bulgars maintain that the suffix was developed "independently of the internal organism of the Bulgarian language"; [1] that consequently the Macedonian article is a Bulgarian feature, and the Macedonian dialects are branches of the Bulgarian. In the meantime, the most distinguished Slav philologists are not of the opinion that the Bulgarian suffix developed "independently of the internal organism of the Bulgarian language," or that it is a Bulgarian speciality, but hold it to be a relic of the old Thraco-Illyrian languages which is to be found throughout the whole of the Albanian zone, in

[1] Lj. Miletić, "O članu u bugarskom jeziku" ("The Article in the Bulgarian Language"), Zagreb, 1886, p. 2.

Macedonia, Bulgaria and Roumania; therefore not only in Bulgarian, but also in the Albanian, Serbian, and Roumanian languages, which have no connection with the evolution of the Bulgarian language.[1]

The Bulgarian and Macedonian suffixes differ in kind. In Bulgarian the suffix is invariably *tъ* (masculine), *ta* (feminine), *to* (neuter). In Macedonian we find, besides the suffixes *tъ*, *ta*, *to*, also *nъ*, *na*, *no*, and *vъ*, *va*, *vo*, which are non-existent in Bulgarian.

Finally, according to rule, the article *must* be invariably employed in Bulgarian, whereas in the Macedonian dialects it occurs but rarely. In the eighteenth-century Macedonian MSS. Collection the article is used but seldom. In the first 105 pages of the collection it is employed only 37 times, and that very arbitrarily. Masculine nouns never appear with the article. Feminine and neuter nouns frequently appear with the articles *va* and *vo* instead of *ta* and *to*.[2] In 27 poems from Macedonia published in 1822 by Vuk Karadžić, the article occurs only 25 times in the whole 340 verses, and then not always after the noun, but more often after the possessive pronoun and the conjunction *kao* (as). In 121 poems from Debar the article *tъ*, *ta*, *to* occurs only 47 times; *nъ*, *na*, *no* occurs 12 times, and *vъ*, *va*, *vo* 22 times. In about 150 ballads from Macedonia, containing in all 2,600 verses, we find the article 106 times all told; and this number includes 34 cases which do not belong to the Macedo-Bulgarian variety but to the purely Macedonian form of the article.

[1] Fr. Miklosich, "Syntaxis," p. 127. "Die Slavischen Elemente im Rumänischen," p. 7.

[2] "Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije," vol. xxxi. p. 12.

XII

NATIONAL CUSTOMS

Old Slav tribal system completely broken up by Old Bulgarian State system—Tribal system preserved in Macedonia and other Serbian lands—Hence the identity of social conditions and customs—Typically Serbian customs in Macedonia—The "Slava"—Bulgarian campaign against "Slava" in Macedonia—"Preslava"—Village "Slava"—Custom of Pilgrimage to Serbian monasteries—Pilgrimages to the Monastery of Dečani

WHEN speaking of the difference between the Bulgars and the Macedonians, we pointed out that the Bulgars with their State system, which they brought with them and transplanted among the conquered Slavs in Bulgaria, crushed for ever every trace of the old Slav tribal organization there. The Slav social system and the customs which are connected with it could never again be revived among the Bulgars, not even during the period when all trace of an independent state was lost among them.[1]

The tribal social system survived for a very long time in Macedonia and in other Serbian lands. The nation, which is identical in Macedonia and in other Serbian lands, and has lived under identical social conditions, has also preserved identical customs. Already before 1861, two Macedonians, the brothers Miladinovci, described some of the Macedonian customs.[2] All their

[1] See pp. 19–20.

[2] The brothers Miladinovci, "Bugarske Narodne Pesme" ("Bulgarian National Ballads"), Agram, 1861, pp. 515–524.

descriptions tally throughout with the descriptions of customs in other Serbian countries. In 1886 the Russian savant and great authority in Macedonia, Iv. S. Jastrebov,[1] published an extensive volume on the national customs of Macedonia. His description of their customs connected with the observance of Christmas, New Year, Epiphany, the carnival, St. Lazar, Great Sunday, St. George's Day, the popular prayers for rain ("dodole"), their marriage, birth, and funeral customs, the "Slava," etc., tally absolutely with the descriptions of the same customs as practised among other Serbs. In 1907 the Royal Serbian Academy published a great *collectanea* of customs from the neighbourhood of Skoplje, compiled by At. Petrović,[2] to which the foregoing remarks likewise apply. The author is himself the editor of a series in the "Zbornik" ("Collectanea") of Serbian national customs, which is published by the Royal Serbian Academy in Belgrade. One of the MSS. he had prepared for publication before the war was a lengthy monograph on the customs of the neighbourhood of Gevgeli, compiled prior to 1912 by the schoolmaster Mr. St. Tanović, a native of Gevgeli. Here we have descriptions of customs day by day throughout the year; then the customs connected with birth, marriage, and funerals, agriculture, hunting, fishing, cattle rearing, trade, etc. All, absolutely all, these customs of the neighbourhood of Gevgeli, as a whole and in detail, are neither more nor less than the customs found also among other parts of the Serbian

[1] Iv. S. Jastrebov, "Običaj i pjesni Tureckih Serbov" ("Customs and Songs of the Turkish Serbs"), Petrograd, 1886 (in Russian).

[2] "Srpski Etnografski Zbornik" ("Serbian Ethnographic Collectanea"), vol. vii. pp. 333–528.

nation. But not even a superficial view of the Macedonian customs reveals any such similarity when comparing them with Bulgarian customs.

It is not an unimportant fact that the customs of the Macedonians and the rest of the Serbs should differ from those of the Bulgars. There are many customs which are peculiar to the Macedonian and other Serbs, and the Bulgars have nothing to resemble them. And precisely because these customs have been observed by the Serbs from ancient times, and other nations do not possess them, the Serbs have come to consider some of them as distinctive Serbian characteristics. The best example of this is provided by the custom of the "Slava" (the literal meaning of this word is "celebration," but it also has the meaning of "renown" and "glory"), or "krsno ime" (Christian name), "sveti" (saint, holy), "sveti dan" (saint day or holy day), or "dan svetoga" (the day of the saint), as this custom is variously called by the Serbs. This is a relic of the old pagan ancestor worship, which with the transition to the Christian faith was transformed into the worship of some Christian saint (most frequently St. Nicholas, St. Michael the Archangel, St. George, St. Demetrius, or St. John). Every Serb has a family patron saint. The day dedicated to that saint is the Serbian "slava." The "slava" is attended by many minor customs, which are identical with all Serbs. According to the unanimous opinion of all scientific authorities, both Serbian and foreign, who have studied the customs of the "slava," it is an exclusively Serbian custom.[1] The Serbs have a proverb: "Gde je slava, tu je Srbin" ("Where there

[1] The "slava" is unknown among the neighbouring Croats and Bulgars (C. Jireček, "Geschichte der Serben," i. p. 181).

is 'slava,' there is the Serb"). The "slava" is looked upon as a sacred custom; it is handed down from father to son as a precious inheritance, and disappears only with the disappearance of the family itself. All Serbs who worship the same saint are considered akin. The "slava" is so distinctly a Serbian custom that even the Catholic Serbs observe it. Even the Mohammedan Serbs, who have ceased to observe "slava" for religious reasons, still know their "slava" and bestow gifts upon Christian Churches on that day. Therefore it may be with good reason assumed that the observance of "slava" marks the frontiers of the Serbian nation.

All Macedonians keep "slava." The Bulgars do not. In describing the national customs in Macedonia, Iv. S. Jastrebov, for many years Russian Consul in Macedonia, says: "'Slava' is observed by the Serbs not only in Serbia, Austria, Hungary, Bosnia, Hercegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Morava and the Prizren district, but also in the counties of Skoplje, Veles, Prilep, Bitolj, and Ochrida in exactly the same way as it is celebrated in the counties of Debar and Tetovo."[1] Moreover, the "slava" is designated by the same names in Macedonia as in other Serbian countries ("slava," "krsno ime," "sveti," "sveti dan," "dan svetoga," "služba").[2] There, too, it is kept by everybody. Many detailed descriptions of the "slava" in Macedonia have appeared on various occasions.[3] All the details attending the "slava"

[1] Iv. S. Jastrebov, "Običaj i pjesni Tureckih Serbov" ("Customs and Songs of the Turkish Serbs"), p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., pp. 1–22. S. Tomić, "Naselja Srpskih Zemalja" ("Settlements of the Serbian Lands"), vol. iii. pp. 467–469. At. Petrović, "Srpski Etnografski Zbornik" ("Serbian Ethnographic Collectanea"), vol. vii. pp. 436–438. J. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep," pp. 160–167.

in Macedonia are the same as the details attending it in other Serbian countries. In Macedonia, too, it is a sacred custom, which is not dropped under any circumstances. The inhabitants of Skoplje Crna Gora believe that "whoever fails to keep 'slava' one year, will not live to see next year's."[1] There, too, the "slava" is handed down as a sacred heritage from father to son until the family becomes extinct. But as a matter of fact the celebration of "slava" outlasts even the family. A man who has no descendants will see to it that his "slava" does not become extinct with his death. A wealthy but childless peasant of the village of Čučar in the Skoplje Crna Gora left all his property to a neighbour on condition that he would keep his "slava" as well as his own, and would celebrate it every year.[2] Another important fact is that instead of worshipping the Christian saints common to all the Churches, the Macedonians, like the Serbs of other countries, frequently give preference to Serbs who have been canonized, such as St. Simeon Mirotočivi (Stephan Nemanja, Grand Župan of Serbia, February 13th), St. Sava (Sava Nemanjić, son of Stephan Nemanja, first Archbishop of Serbia, January 14th), St. Stephan Dečanski (November 11th), etc. Sometimes an entire village will celebrate the same Serbian patron saint. For the sake of example we will merely quote the case of the village of Radibuž, between Kumanovo and Palanka, where everybody celebrates St. Sava's Day.

Finally, I will mention that the earliest record of the Serbian "slava" is from Macedonia. The Greek historian Skylitzes has given us a description of the "slava" of the Serbian vojvode Ivac by the Lake

[1] S. Tomić, "Naselja, etc.," vol. iii. p. 469. [2] Ibid., p. 469.

of Ochrida, as early as 1018. The vojvode Ivac worshipped the virgin Mary on August 15th. It is interesting to note that the description of the "Slava," as kept by the vojvode Ivac and observed by Skylitzes, shows the same features which still distinguish the customs incidental to the "slava." [1]

Of all Serbian customs in Macedonia we have laid special stress upon the "slava," because it is a typically Serbian custom. Moreover, the Bulgars have attached special significance to the "slava." No sooner had they begun their agitation in Macedonia than they considered it their first duty to stamp out this Serbian custom. To this end they had recourse to various expedients. At first their agents, priests, and schoolmasters told the populace that the "slava" was a pagan custom, that it was not sanctioned by the Church, and that it ought therefore to be discontinued.[2] Later on they resorted to threats, and the malediction of the Church upon those who refused to give up the "slava." Finally, when the comitadji action began, recalcitrants were at first given strict warning, then fined, and finally put to death. The archives of the Serbian Ministry of the Interior contain official proofs in every case of persecution in connection with the keeping of "slava" in Macedonia.

But all this was of no avail. The Serbs have the proverb: "Bolje da selo propadne, nego u selu običaj" ("Better the ruin of the village, than of the village customs"). The people faithfully continued to celebrate

[1] B. Prokić: "Vojvoda Ivac, najstariji istorijski spomen o slavi u Makedoniji"—("Vojvoda Ivac, Earliest Historical Record of the Slava in Macedonia"), "Brastvo," vols. ix.–x., Belgrade, 1902, pp. 5, etc.

[2] Iv. S. Jastrebov, "Običaj, etc.," p. 3. "Izvjestija Slavjanskog Blagotvoritelnog Obštetva," 1887, Nos. 11–12, p. 556.

their "slava" in Macedonia, and preserved it jealously as a precious inheritance.

Another typically Serbian custom is the keeping of "Preslava." The customs of the "preslava" are the same as those of the "slava," only they are fewer in number and less complicated. Every Serb keeps "preslava" as well as "slava." In Macedonia, too, "preslava" is kept by whole towns and villages.[1] The Bulgars have nothing remotely like it.

In the last place I must also mention the *village* (*seoska*) "slava." This festival is a relic from the times when the entire settlement of kinsfolk worshipped the common god and eventually the patron saint. It consists in the meeting in prayer of the whole village, a common banquet, festivity, and dance at a special spot in the village. This custom is by no means to be confused with the village gatherings at church festivals and the processions common all over Europe. The "village slava" is an exclusively Serbian custom, common to all Serbs and consequently also to the Macedonians. It is really the "slava," only extended to the entire village.[2] The Bulgars do not possess this custom either.

We could quote several other customs which the Macedonians share with all other Serbs, but I think this ought to suffice. In the meantime I will quote one more custom, because it affords convincing proof of the national identity of the Macedonian Serbs with those of other countries. All Serbs, no matter where they live, pay great respect to their monasteries, more especially

[1] Iv. S. Jastrebov, "Običaj," pp. 22-23.

[2] S. Tomić, "Naselja, etc.," vol. iii. p. 467. J. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep," p. 167.

to those Serbian monasteries which played a prominent part in the culture and politics of Serbia's past, or where lie buried the great and worthy men who have since been canonized by the Serbian Church. To these monasteries the Serbian people repair even from very great distances. Sometimes it is a pilgrimage of ten days' journey. In olden times these pilgrimages to the Serbian monasteries took place more frequently than now. Every one who was able considered it a patriotic duty to visit them at least once in his life, to express his respect and to present them with gifts. Thus Serbs from all Serbian lands used to go on pilgrimage to the Monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos, the oldest of the Serbian monasteries and the earliest centre of Serbian literature and civilization. Another spot, visited particularly by Serbs from Serbia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, Vidin, and the Sofia counties is the Monastery of Studenica, where St. Stephan Nemanja and St. Stephan Prvovenčani lie buried. The monasteries in Srem, where rest the bones of Tsar Uroš, Prince Lazar, Stephan Štiljanović, and other Serbian saints, are favourite places of pilgrimage for the Serbs of all the Serbian lands under Austria. In the same manner the Serbian people used to go on pilgrimage to the Monastery of Rilo, where the body of St. John Rilski is preserved, one of the earliest preachers of Christianity among the Serbs, and to the Monastery of Dečani, where rests that of Stephan Dečanski. This pious custom prevails also in Macedonia. The Macedonians, too, repair to the monasteries to worship the relics there, and that in the same monasteries as other Serbs. And because they were the nearest at hand, the Macedonians most frequently went to the Monasteries of Dečani, Hilendar, Rilo, and the Patriarchal Monastery of Ipek.

The departure for the monasteries was a very solemn custom in Macedonia. Every year, on appointed days, from fifty to a hundred men from certain villages would repair to one or other of the Serbian monasteries. Besides their own gifts, they carried also the gifts of their kinsfolk, neighbours, fellow townsmen, and guild. On the appointed day the pilgrims, arrayed in their Sunday clothes, first went to the church to pray. After prayer they set forth, accompanied by the priests in full canonicals, bearing crosses and icons, and by the populace. At the gates or confines of the town they took leave and went on their way. Their reception at the monastery was an equally solemn affair. The monks in canonicals, with crosses and icons, came out to meet them. At the place of meeting a short prayer was said, and then, singing hymns, the procession went on to the monastery. On the following day a solemn service was held, after which the pilgrims would kiss the relics of the Serbian kings and saints preserved in the monastery and present their gifts. The departure from the monastery and the reception of the pilgrims on their return home were likewise solemn occasions. The Bulgars, too, have their holy places and their relics, but the Macedonians know nothing about them.

Of all monasteries the Macedonians went most frequently to Dečani, where is the tomb of the Serbian king Stephan Dečanski (1321–1331). This is the very king of Serbia who defeated the Bulgars at Velbužd in 1330 and so decided the fate of Macedonia in favour of Serbia for the rest of the Middle Ages. Stephan Dečanski is the most popular saint in Macedonia. He is never called anything else there but the "*Holy King*." Before the Bulgarian propaganda made its appearance in Macedonia,

every well-to-do Macedonian used to consider it a religious and patriotic duty to go at least once in his life to worship at the tomb of the Holy King and to bear gifts to his monastery. And in every house in Macedonia could be seen the icon of the Holy King, beside that of the patron saint of the house.

This custom of going on pilgrimage to Serbian monasteries shows the purely Serbian feeling of the Macedonians. The special respect for Stephan Dečanski, who in 1330 defended Macedonia from a Bulgarian invasion, shows how strong that feeling is.

XIII

POPULAR TRADITION

Beauty and wealth of Serbian popular tradition—Ethnographic element and historic memories enshrined in it—Macedonia considered a Serbian country by non-Macedonian Serbian popular tradition—National tradition of Macedonia shows a purely Serbian character—Example from beginning of eighteenth century—Examples from the nineteenth century—Folk poetry in Macedonia purely Serbian—Bulgarian collections of Macedonian national poetry reveal purely Serbian characters in spite of touching and editing—Reference to none but Serbian historic events, places, and characters—No reference to Bulgarian historic events, places, and characters—Serbian monasteries famous in Macedonian folk poetry—Serbian names in Macedonian poetry—Language in Macedonian poetry pure Serbian—According to national tradition the liberation and unification of all Serbia is bound up with Macedonia

IT has long been a matter of general knowledge that Serbian popular and national tradition is exceptionally rich and beautiful. It is also generally recognized that Vuk St. Karadžić (1787–1864), the first collector of Serbian national traditions, was honest and expert in his work. This is what earned for Serbian popular tradition such great European renown at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and won for its collector the respect and friendship of such great men as Goethe, Grimm, Charles Nodier, Prosper Mérimée, John Bowring, Walter Scott, etc. "The Serbs have a right to be proud of their nationa

poems, but they ought to be even more proud of their Vuk St. Karadžić," says the Bulgarian savant, Dr. Iv. Šišmanov.[1]

What is less known is that Serbian popular and national tradition teems with Serbian ethnographic elements and Serbian historic memories. It is a mine of information on the subject of Serbian national customs, culture, and national self-revelation; it is also full of references to historic events in Serbia's past, her historic spots and personages. If any one were to conceive the idea of delimiting the frontiers of the Serbian nation on the basis of the area over which Serbian popular and national tradition extends, he would be well on the side of truth.

Serbian national ballads from the Serbian lands outside Macedonia always refer to the latter as a Serbian land. A national ballad from Srem, taken down by Vuk St. Karadžić at the beginning of the nineteenth century, sings of the cities, princes, and vojvodes of the Middle Ages. Apart from its exceptional beauty, the distinguishing feature of this ballad is that in it a Serb from Srem, giving voice to the general conviction of the Serbian nation as to its extent, includes Macedonia within the Serbian national frontiers. The ballad mentions the following cities, princes, and vojvodes in Macedonia; thus:—

In *Kratovo* the white-walled city
Had his dwelling *Kratovac Radonja*;
In the shining town of *Kumanovo*
Had his dwelling *Kostadin the Bey*;

[1] "Sbornik za narodni umotvorenia nauka i knižnina" ("Collection of Folk-lore, Science and Literature"), i., Sofia, 1889, p. 15 (in Bulgarian).

And in *Solun* (Salonica) the white-walled city
Had his dwelling the *vojvode Dojčin*;
But in *Prilep* the white-walled city
There had *Marko Kraljević* his dwelling.

* * * * *

Hearken thou, sister Marghita, our vojvodos were they;
All of them were among us, and all have passed away.
Some died in their beds, sister, and some in battle were slain;
To-day doth Rajko alone of them in Srijem remain
Like a dry tree in the mountain grove. . . .[1]

Various other national ballads collected outside Macedonia mention every Macedonian city and site of importance as well as all the historic personages connected with Macedonia. They are, in fact, full of references to Skoplje, Kratovo, Kumanovo, Ochrida, Kostur, Bitolj, Salonica, Serez, the Rivers Vardar and Marica, and to Tsar Stephan (Dušan), King Vukašin, Uglješa, King Marko and his brothers, Mina of Kostur, Bogdan, the Dejanovići, Momčilo, etc. Nay, more than this, these are the most important spots and the most favourite characters in Serbian national poetry.

Serbian national ballads glory in the Serbian past in Macedonia and in all the Serbian memories there. In a ballad published for the first time in 1826 by Vuk S. Karadžić,[2] we are told how one day two of the best-known heroes in Serbian romance, Marko Kraljević and Miloš Obilić, were out riding on Mount Miroč. Then Marko asked Miloš to sing to him and Miloš granted his request. The national ballads lavish special praise upon the singing of Miloš and upon his beautiful voice. So that the matter of the song might be worthy of the singing, the ballad-maker could think of no better

[1] Vuk St. Karadžić, "Srpske narodne pesme" ("Serbian National Ballads"), vol. iii., Belgrade, 1894, pp. 54–55.

[2] "Danica" for 1826, Vienna, 1826, pp. 207–212.

subject than the following "beautiful song," as he calls it:—

Of our elders and our betters
That held the kingdom long,
In famous Macedonia,
And built the sacred shrines.

The Serbian ballads strictly differentiate between the people of Serbia and Macedonia—who are Serbs—and the people of Bulgaria—who are not. Speaking of the Dečani Church in the ballad of the building of the Monastery of Dečani we find the following verse:—

In it shall the liturgy be chanted,
There the *Serbian nation* will be gathered,
From all *Serbia and Macedonia*,
And the sister nation from Bulgaria.[1]

Serbian national poetry shows us the Macedonian heroes with the same customs as those observed by other Serbs. We have already said that the most distinctive Serbian custom is the "slava." Even as the ballads tell us that Tsar Dušan and Prince Lazar kept their "slavas," so we are told that

Slava keepeth Kraljević Marko,
Kept his slava on St. George's Day;
Many strangers came to feast with Marko,
Priests two hundred, holy monks three hundred,
And beside them *twelve Serbian bishops*."[2]

Constantine Dejanović,[3] too, is shown celebrating his "slava," and so are other Macedonian heroes of the national ballads.

[1] S. Ristić, "Dečanski spomenici" ("Dečani Records"), Belgrade, 1864, p. 71.

[2] V. S. Karadžić, "Srpske narodne pesme" ("Serbian National Ballads"), vol. ii., Vienna, p. 215.

[3] Ibid., p. 355.

But more than that of other Serbian lands, popular tradition in Macedonia itself reveals the Serbian character of Macedonia. Popular tradition in Macedonia, in fact, has never known her to be anything else but Serbian.

In 1704, Jerotije Račanin, a monk of Rakovica near Belgrade, travelled to Jerusalem. On his way through Macedonia he made notes of what he learnt about local tradition from the inhabitants. All he noted down goes to show that at that time only Serbian memories survived among the natives. A day's walk south of Vranja the peasants showed him the site where "in the days of the *Serbian* rule there was a big town" with forty churches, so that the Turks still call it Krk-klisa (forty churches). Not far from there is another spot called Šatorišta (the place of the *šator* = tents), where Marko Kraljević, Miloš Obilić, Relja Omučević, and Novak Debelić pitched their tents. All these heroes are Serbian characters. From there Račanin went to Gorobinci in the Ovče Polje, where he spent the night. The peasants there showed him the ruins of old cities and churches "which once upon a time the Serbs had built, but which are now all deserted." They also told him that when the Serbs first settled in these lands "they came first to the Ovče Polje and there built a threshing-floor of copper, because they did not know how to thresh on the ground." Of the Demir Kapija on the Vardar, Račanin says that the people called it "Kraljevć Marko's Demir Kapija." [1]

Popular traditions collected in Macedonia during the nineteenth century reveal the Serbian character of the country still more clearly. Macedonia is specially rich

[1] "Glasnik Srpskog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. pp. 228–230.

in traditions of those Serbian historic characters who at one time lived in Macedonia, such as King Milutin, Stephan Dečanski, Tsar Dušan, Kralievič Marko,[1] etc. But there are also many persons in Serbian history who never had any connection at all with Macedonia and whose memory nevertheless lives on in Macedonian tradition, such as St. Stephan Nemanja and St. Sava. Travelling through Macedonia about Easter-time, 1914, I was told by the natives that the village of Nemanjica, near Ištip, was called after Stephan Nemanja. Concerning the villages of Breško and Bojilovce in the Žegligovo district, I made a note of the local tradition that St. Sava had stayed there once and that he cursed the former and blessed the later.

Better still than in the prose tradition is the Serbian character of the country shown in the poetic tradition of Macedonia. Already in 1822 Vuk S. Karadžič said of the ballads which he took down from two merchants of Razlog that they were Serbian poetry. The Russian scholar V. Grigorovič also collected national ballads during his travels in Macedonia in 1844. Although an enthusiastic Bulgarophile, and accompanied at the time by Bulgars, he could say nothing more of the national ballads of Macedonia that could be turned to Bulgaria's advantage but that they were translations or imitations of Serbian ballads.[2] When the Bulgar P. Draganov, professor at the Bulgarian Lycée in Salonica, collected national ballads in Macedonia, he was charmed by their

[1] Brothers Miladinovci, "Bugarske Narodne Pesme," pp. 527–528. S. Tomić, "Naselja," vol. iii. pp. 430–468. Iv. Ivanić, "Maćedonija i Maćedonci," vol. ii. pp. 166–170. F. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep," p. 61. St. Novaković, "Balkanska Pitanja" ("The Balkan Question"), p. 224.

[2] V. Jagić, "Enciklopædija Slavjanskoj filologiji" ("Encyclopædia of Slav Philology"), i., Petrograd, 1910, p. 533 (in Russian).

Serbian character and could not refrain from pointing out that one cannot fail to be struck by the presence of many Serbian elements in the national poems of Macedonia.[1] Any collection of Macedonian national ballads reveals at a glance that the subjects of Macedonian national poetry are the Serbian past, Serbian historic spots and characters. The Bulgars are never mentioned in it. Whoever knows the Serbian national ballads will have noticed that there is no difference at all between the Macedonian ballads and those collected in other Serbian countries.

Although the Serbian collectors of national ballads were both accurate and honest in their work, we shall purposely abstain from making use of their collection in proving our contention that the national poetry of Macedonia is simply Serbian. We shall also refrain from using the excellent collection of national ballads from Macedonia compiled by that great authority on Macedonia, Iv. S. Jastrebov, who was for many years Consul there and is a scholar of recognized standing. The Bulgars have cast doubts upon the correctness and authentic value of all collections of Macedonian ballads not made by one of themselves. Nevertheless, I shall base my proof solely upon such collections of Macedonian songs and ballads as have been compiled by Bulgarian collectors. My reasons for so doing are, firstly, that I wish to disarm criticism, even if it were to come from Bulgarian quarters, and, secondly, that evidence culled from Bulgarian collections is already sufficient to prove the purely Serbian character of Macedonian folk-poetry.

[1] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-Slavjanski Sbornik" ("Macedonian-Slav Collection"), i., Petrograd, 1894, p. viii (in Russian).

Speaking of the Bulgarian collections of national ballads from Macedonia, it is necessary to make a few important preliminary remarks. In the first place, the collections of popular tradition in Macedonia was entrusted to half-educated Bulgarian teachers, priests, and agents. Moreover, the Bulgars were in a desperate hurry to lay before the world as many Macedonian ballads as possible under the name of Bulgarian ballads, and the work done was hurried and unequal. It has already been pointed out long ago that the Bulgars in their zeal for Macedonia actually collected more ballads from Macedonia than from the whole of Bulgaria and all the Bulgarian countries put together.[1] And on this scale the Bulgars have been working ever since. Finally they deemed it necessary to press even the national tradition of Macedonia into the service of their political aspirations; and just as they ruthlessly persecuted the Serbian element and destroyed all Serbian records in Macedonia, so they endeavoured to purge her tradition of all that could recall the Serbs. But as without this element there simply would have been no tradition, they found themselves compelled either to invent a new tradition or touch up and edit that one already in existence until it should no longer too obviously betray its Serbian origin. We have already had occasion to mention to what lengths Stephan Verković went in his "Veda Slovenska," in faking popular tradition and folk-lore in Macedonia.[2] In his review of Pipin and Spasović's "Bulgarian Literature," Dr. V. Jagić, Professor of Slavistic at the University of Vienna and the

[1] St. Protić, "O Makedoniji" ("Concerning Macedonia"), Belgrade, 1886, p. 86.

[2] See pp. 128–129.

greatest living Slavist, gives the following criticism of the work done by the Bulgarian collectors of popular tradition: "A record of the new and newest Bulgarian literature is not so much in a position to reveal products of real literature as sundry patriotic and intellectual achievements (establishment of schools, publication of school books) and battles for the emancipation of the Bulgarian Church from the Greek influence. . . . The labour devoted to collection in the field of national ballad poetry approaches most nearly to the standard of real literature. Unfortunately precisely this branch of literary activity includes a curious fraud ("ein merkwürdiger Schwindel"), whereby fantastic speculations are bolstered up with undeniable national treasures. The comment passed by the authors (Pipin and Spasović) upon the conduct of Rakovski and Verković is fully deserved. May their example not only find no imitation, but speedy correction in accordance with truth on the part of the Bulgars themselves."[1] Even among the Bulgars there were some sober-minded scholars who recognized the valuelessness of such work in the collection of popular tradition. Praising Vuk S. Karadžić, the collector of the Serbian ballads, Professor Iv. Šišmanov of the University of Sofia says: "Our collectors are far from being Vuk Karadžić."[2]

But no warning availed to prevent the Bulgars from pressing Macedonian popular tradition into the service of their political aspirations. How skilfully they went to work in this may be seen from the following example.

[1] V. Jagić, "Archiv für Slavische Philologie," vol. iv., 1880, pp. 471–472.

[2] Dr. Iv. D. Šišmanov, "Značenije i zadača na našata etnografia"—"Importance and Task of our Ethnographic" ("Sbornik za narodni umotvorenia," i., 1889, p. 15).

In 1889 the Bulgarian Ministry of Education began the publication in Sofia of the "Sbornik za narodni umotvorenia" ("Collection of Folk-lore"). This "Sbornik" gave very much of the national tradition, mostly from Macedonia. At first the editors, although very cautiously, yet allowed some features of Macedonian tradition which clearly betrayed its Serbian origin to be included in the "Sbornik."[1] In 1894 a collection of national ballads from Macedonia, made by P. Draganov, Professor at the Bulgaria Lycée in Salonica, was published in Petrograd.[2] This collection included a large number of ballads of Serbian historic characters not specifically Macedonian. K. Šapkarov wrote a scathing review of this collection, and attacked Draganov with the whole fury of an outraged Bulgarian patriot for publishing ballads of characters from Serbian history; he also endeavoured to prove that Macedonia possesses no traditions of the Serbian past.[3] From that time the "Sbornik" ceased to contain Macedonian traditions concerning Serbian characters and events, excepting only those characters who had spent their lives in Macedonia and such events as had taken place on her soil!

In spite of all precautions, however, even in these Bulgarian collections the Macedonian ballads have remained Serbian. We shall use them simply to show the identity of popular tradition in Macedonia with that of other Serbian lands. We have before us three indis-

[1] One of the first volumes of the "Sbornik" even included the Serbian ballad of the "Battle of Kosovo," which was taken down in Macedonia ("Sbornik," iii. pp. 85–94).

[2] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-Slavjanki Sbornik" ("Macedonian-Slav Collection"), Petrograd, 1894.

[3] "Sbornik za narodni umotvorenia," vol. xii. pp. 51–53.

putably Bulgarian collections of national ballads from Macedonia:—

(1) *The Brothers Dimitrije and Constantine Miladinovci*, "Bulgarian National Ballads," Zagreb, 1861.—The brothers Miladinovci were Serbs from Struga on Lake Ochrida, but at an early date they joined the anti-Greek movement in Macedonia, eventually joining the Bulgarian party and remaining faithful to it. Their collection contained songs from various parts of Macedonia. It is compiled in an amateurish manner, but with a considerable bias in favour of the Bulgars. Thence the title "Bulgarian National Ballads."

(2) *P. Draganov*, "Macedonian-Slav Collection," i., Petrograd, 1894.—Draganov is a genuine Bulgar, by birth a native of Bessarabia. He was professor at the Bulgarian Lycée (College) in Salonica. Being an ardent Bulgar he worked zealously at the Bulgarization of the Serbian students attending the Bulgarian Lycée (see Supplement No. II). Through his pupils he collected ballads and songs from all parts of Macedonia.

(3) *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenia, nauka a knižnina* (Collection of folk-lore, science, and literature).—The publication of this collection was begun by the Ministry of Education in 1889, and it is really an official publication by the Bulgarian Government. Eighteen bulky volumes of it have already appeared. Among other matter it also contains many national ballads, mostly from Macedonia.

If we compare these Macedonian ballads, which were collected by Bulgarians, with the national ballads of other Serbian countries, we observe the following:—

(1) The motives of both are identical. There is not one Macedonian song or ballad, except those which bear

a purely local character, variants of which cannot be found among the ballads of other Serbian regions.

(2) The events commemorated in both are absolutely identical. This fact is most noticeable in ballads which sing of historic events. These events are taken only from Serbian history (the Battle of Kosovo, the fall of the city of Stalać, the building of the Monastery of Dečani, the single combats of Kraljević Marko, the fights of the Serbian people against the Turks, the liberation of Serbia, etc.). P. Draganov was amazed by this phenomenon in Macedonian folk-poetry, and felt constrained to remark upon it as follows in the introduction to his collection: "In the first place, one is struck by the fact that of all the Tsars, Kings, Vojvodas, heroes, and other characters of these ballads, leading parts are assigned only to *favourite characters and famous events of Serbian mediæval, modern, and recent history*." [1]

(3) The localities mentioned in both are absolutely identical. Whoever knows Serbian folk-poetry even from translation knows that the Serbian countries most frequently mentioned in it are Serbia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, Montenegro, Srem, Macedonia; and the towns of Kruševac, Stalać, Belgrade, Prizren, Novi Pazar, Niš, Vranje (in Serbia); Sarajevo, Mostar, Trebinje (in Bosnia-Hercegovina); Buda, Janok, Temišvar, Slankamen, Varadin (in the regions of Austria-Hungary inhabited by Serbs); Prilep, Bitolj, Skoplje, Ochrida, Kostur, Kratovo (Macedonia); and the Rivers Danube, Sava, Morava, Vardar, Sitnica. Other famous spots in Serbian history are Kosovo, the Šar Mountain, Kačanik,

[1] P. Draganov, "Makedonsko-Slavjanski Sbornik" ("Macedonian-Slav-Collection"), p. viii.

Dukadjin; and the Monasteries of Hilendar, Dečani, Ravanica, Gračanica, etc. These identical places are also those most frequently mentioned in Macedonian folk-poetry. The place-names we have enumerated here we have taken from collections of Macedonian national ballads, compiled by Bulgarian collectors.

(4) The heroes celebrated in both are identical. In the ballads which sing of historic personages, the characters all belong to Serbian history, as Tsar Simeon (Stephan Nemanja, 1169–1196), his son St. Sava, Stephan Dečanski (Serbian king, 1321–1331), Tsar Stephan Dušan (1331–1355), Tsar Lazar (of Kosovo fame, d. 1389) and his wife Milica (d. 1395), their son Lazarević (1389–1426), Milos Obilić, Toplica Milan, Kosančić Ivan, Jug Bogdan, the nine Jugovići, Vuk Branković (Kosovo heroes); Kraljević Marko (1371–1394), Dete Dukadjinče, Relja Krilatica, Todor of Stalać, Vojvode Momčilo, Bolani Dojčin, Starina Novak, Gruja Novaković, Deli Tatomir, Pavle Pletikosa, the Senkovići, Ivan Crnojević (of Montenegro), Krčmarica (hostess) Mara, Kara-George (1804–1813), Hajduk Veljko (d. 1813), Ilija Strelja (Ilija Delija), Prince Miloš Obrenović (1815–1839 and 1859–1860), Prince Milan Obrenović (1868–1888). This list also we have taken from collections of ballads from Macedonia, which were compiled by Bulgarian collectors.

(5) Macedonian folk-poetry is quite ignorant of Bulgarian historic sites and Bulgarian historical character. Some slight reference to Bulgars, such as the allusions to King Šišman and the Plain of Sofia, are quite insignificant even if they are not deliberate interpolations.

The Bulgars do not possess the word *kralj* for

"king."[1] It is a term that only a Serb would use. The Sofijsko Polje (Sofia Plain) is not a Bulgarian, but a Serbian county.[2] Serbian folk-poetry makes frequent mention of foreign lands such as Italy, Hungary, Venice, Albania, Roumania, Russia, Turkey, and Bulgaria and their heroes. It is a very significant fact that Bulgaria and the Bulgars are mentioned less in Macedonia folk-poetry than in ballads of other Serbian lands. Bulgarian history, too, had its great events, its famous sites and characters; but the Macedonians know nothing about them. What they know is purely Serbian.

(6) The old Serbian monasteries play a great part in Serbian folk-poetry. Special fame in song is accorded to the Monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos, the first centre of Serbian intellectual life and letters in the Middle Ages. The Bulgars, too, had their monastery on Mount Athos, the Zoograf, which is older than Hilendar, and a very important focus of Bulgarian civilization in the Middle Ages. Wherever Macedonian poetry mentions the monasteries of Mount Athos, it speaks only of Hilendar. The Zoograf monastery is not even mentioned. Other Serbian monasteries are famous in Macedonian ballads, but not one Bulgarian monastery is mentioned. It is especially important that Dečani should provide a favourite theme. There is even a ballad specially devoted to the building of the Monastery

[1] The word "kralj" is unknown to the Bulgars. That is the reason why the present King of Bulgaria is never called "King" in Bulgaria but "Tsar." The words "kralj" and "kraljica" (king and queen) are as familiar in Macedonia as in other Serbian countries. Both in poetry and in ordinary conversation Kraljević Marko is referred to as "Kralj Marko."

[2] Serbian folk-poetry never looks upon Sofia and its surroundings as anything but Serbian.

of Dečani. Dečani was built by Stephan Dečanski and dedicated to God in gratitude for the victory over the Bulgars in 1330.

(7) The terms "Serb," [1] "Bosnian," [2] "Montenegrin," [3] "Croat," [4] etc., occur frequently in Macedonian poetry. The term "Bulgar" occurs so rarely that it is practically non-existent.

(8) Finally the language of the Macedonian ballad is Serbian and not Bulgarian. In writing his book on the sounds "*dj*" and "*ćj*" in the Macedonian dialects of Serbian, St. Novaković drew upon the philological material contained in the collections of Macedonian ballads compiled by Bulgarian collectors, and he has proved conclusively that the language spoken in Macedonia is Serbian.

The favourite hero of all Serbian national tradition in general, of Serbian folk-poetry in particular, is the Macedonian king of old, Marko Kraljević (1371–1394). "There is no Serb who does not know the name of Kraljević Marko," said the greatest authority on the Serbian nation, Vuk St. Karadžić in the earlier half of the nineteenth century. Marko Kraljević is the most popular hero of Macedonia national tradition. He is famous in song and story everywhere among the Serbian people. There is no end to the songs and legends about his childhood, his heroism, his marriage, his love of justice, his combats, and finally of his disappearance from this world. According to popular tradition, Marko did not die, but withdrew into a cave

[1] Brothers Miladinovci, p. 355. P. Draganov, pp. 60, 155, 156, 157, 158. "Sbornik," iv. p. 69; xiv. pp. 92, etc.

[2] P. Draganov, p. 200.

[3] Ibid., p. 141.

[4] Ibid., pp. 91, 141. "Sbornik," xi. pp. 35, etc.

together with his horse Šarac. Before the horse he laid a little moss, he smote the rock with his sword, cleaving it and leaving the sword in the cliff, and then lay down and fell asleep. Since that time Marko has slept continuously. His horse is slowly eating the moss, his sword is gradually working its way out of the rock. When the moss is all eaten, and the sword comes out of the rock, then Marko will awake and come forth from his cave, and deliver and unite all the Serbian people.[1] The cave where Marko sleeps, and whence the Serbian people according to the popular belief awaits its deliverance and unity, is in the Demir Kapija on the Vardar in Macedonia.[2] Already in 1704 the monk Jervotije Račanin made a note of the fact that the Demir Kapija on the Vardar is by the people called "Marko Kraljević's Demir Kapija."[3]

The tradition that Marko will awake, free and unite the Serbian nation is familiar to every Serbian child. When in 1912 the Serbian army flew as on wings on its campaign of liberation to deliver Macedonia from Turkish slavery, it appeared to the soldiers, under the suggestion of the national tradition they had known from childhood, as though they verily saw Kraljević Marko riding in front of them.

Serbian national tradition is the expression of Serbian national opinion. The thought that is dearest to the Serbian nation is the thought of liberation and unity. This its dearest thought is by the Serbian nation bound up with the tradition of Kraljević Marko and with Macedonia.

[1] Vuk S. Karadžić, "Srpski Rječnik" ("Serbian Dictionary"), see under *Marko Kraljević*. J. H. Vasiljević, "Prilep," p. 78. This legend has been frequently published elsewhere as well.

[2] Iv. Ivanić, "Maćedonija i Maćedonci" ("Macedonia and the Macedonians"), i., 1906, pp. 230, 231; ii., 1908, p. 168.

[3] "Glasnik Srpškog Učenog Društva," vol. xxii. p. 230.

XIV

CONCLUSION

THERE remains but one question to be solved if the subject-matter of this book is to be made quite clear, viz. whether the Bulgars were conscious that their agitation in Macedonia was a violation of the rights of others?

The answer to this question is not difficult to find. Whoever has during this war followed the attempts of the Bulgars to convince the world of their rights and frontiers has the reply ready to hand. No sooner had the Bulgarian army entered Eastern Serbia than the Bulgarian papers announced, not the conquest of Serbia, but the "liberation" of Bulgarian lands. University professors and other Bulgarian *savants* lost no time in writing bulky tomes in Bulgarian and other languages explaining that all the land held by the Bulgarian army was Bulgarian, and that the Bulgarian national frontier passes through the middle of Serbia. In these assertions the men of science and of the press, Bulgaria's leading personalities, were followed by the Bulgarian masses like so many apostles, and to-day there is not one man in Bulgaria who would not assert that Serbia is truly Bulgarian land. After entering Serbia the Bulgarian army entered Roumania. Now the very same assertions are being put forward with respect to Roumania. The Bulgarian papers have

immediately announced the "liberation" of Bulgarian lands from Roumanian servitude, and Bulgarian scientists have immediately begun to "restore" the Bulgarian place-names which the Roumanians had "corrupted," and to write on the "Bulgarian past in the villages round Djurdjevo, Kalafat, Braila, Galatz, Ploešti, Crajova, Alexandria, Bucharest, and other places in Roumania."

No matter how young, how uncritical, and uncivilized the Bulgars are, it is obvious that they cannot make these assertions from conviction, but that they are consciously inculcating the robbery and violation of foreign territory.

As they behaved to Serbia and to Roumania in this war under our eyes, so they behaved formerly to Macedonia. In that case also there is positive proof to show that the Bulgars, in the face of facts and with full consciousness, did all they could to filch Macedonia from the Serbs.

One of the first and staunchest friends of Bulgaria over the Macedonian Question was Stefan I. Verković. Already in 1860 he declared that the Macedonians are "*without any national*" (he meant "Bulgarian," of course) "*conscience.*" "That these Macedonian Bulgars," he says, "were formerly called Slavs, is clearly proved by the writings of the Holy Slav Apostles Cyril and Method and their disciples, who all say that they translated the Holy Scriptures into the *Slav language.* It was only at a later date that they received the name of their conquerors, the Bulgars. *This name is therefore rather a political and State name than a national designation.*"[1] His better knowledge, however, did not deter

[1] St. I. Verković, "Narodne pesme Makedonskih Bugara" ("National Ballads of the Macedonian Bulgars"), 1860, pp. 6 and 18

Verković from proclaiming all the regions of European Turkey to be Bulgarian, and from becoming the leading Bulgarian champion in Russia.

A Bulgarian patriot, Prvanov by name, who had been educated in Belgrade, although well aware of the difference between the Serbian and Bulgarian languages, and realizing that the language spoken in Macedonia is Serbian, nevertheless did not scruple to bring out in 1872 his "Alphabets" for the Bulgarian schools in Macedonia, and to point out in their pages that his object in doing so was "that our Macedonian brothers may discard the *Serbian pronunciation* of the Bulgarian idiom."[1]

As early as in 1888 the greatest of the Bulgarian chauvinists, Ofeikoff (the pseudonym of Šopov, Secretary to the Bulgarian Exarch, and afterwards Bulgarian Consul in Salonica), wrote a book in French endeavouring to demonstrate the Bulgarian claim to Macedonia. His book is thoroughly tendencious; nevertheless the author is compelled to confess that before the establishment of the Exarchate the Macedonians "*were devoid of national*" (read "Bulgarian") "*consciousness*" ("étaient privés de conscience nationale").[2]

The well-known Bulgarian leader and statesman, Stambulov, "did not like the Macedonians on account of their treachery and *on account of their lack of all real sense of patriotism*" (Bulgarian patriotism, of course).[3]

Of such instances showing that the Bulgars knew that the Macedonians are not Bulgars we could quote

[1] From P. Draganov's "Izvestija S.P. Slavjanskago Blagotvoritelnago Obščestva," 1888. Quoted in "Macedonia" by St. Protić, p. 18.

[2] Ofeikoff, "La Macédoine," Philipopoli, 1888, p. 45.

[3] "He [Stambuloff] also grew to dislike the Macedonians on account of their treachery and want of real sense of patriotism . . ." "M. Stambuloff," by A. Hulme Beaman, London, 1895, p. 40.

many more, but we will confine ourselves to just one more quotation from a Bulgarian book, in which the Bulgarian point of view regarding Macedonia and the Bulgarian programme there are expounded on the basis of the impression gained during a long time by the Bulgars in Macedonia. The book in question appeared on the occasion of the thousand years' anniversary of SS. Cyril and Method, and is entitled "Macedonia on the Thousandth Anniversary of SS. Cyril and Method; or, The Present Condition of Bulgarism in Macedonia." It is true that in this book, as everywhere else, we find it asserted that Macedonia is a Bulgarian country; but it is very clearly pointed out that the inhabitants are not Bulgarian. "If Macedonia is not to be Bulgarian," says this book, "then the Bulgarian State will not be established. This must be borne in mind and never lost sight of." But "*we must also admit a sad and disgraceful thing. The greatest part of Macedonia is without that national conscience, which is necessary for a nation if it is categorically to demand its rights. Should Europe to-day ask the people of Macedonia to declare to which nationality they belong, I am afraid that the greater part would declare themselves against us.*" In the meantime, "*ten or even five years well employed would be sufficient to make it impossible for any power to prevent the Bulgaria of San Stefano from becoming a reality.*"[1]

Finally I would also mention an occurrence which shows most clearly of all that the Bulgars fully realized that Macedonia contains no Bulgars. Aware of the

[1] We were unable to obtain this book in the original, but have utilized the quotations in the book "Le rôle et les aspirations de la Grèce dans la question d'Orient," by D. Bikelas, Paris, 1885, pp. 46–47.

Serbian national sentiment of the Macedonians and of their insurrection against the Turks and in favour of unification with Serbia, the Bulgars tried immediately after the creation of Bulgaria to promote a rising in Macedonia which they could claim before Europe as an insurrection in favour of Bulgaria.

Eventually the difficulty of inducing the Macedonians to rise in Bulgaria's interest proved as great as Bulgaria's need of the rising. This need was imperative, however, and the Bulgars had recourse to stratagem. In 1879 they issued a proclamation to the people of Macedonia, calling upon them to rise for liberation from the Turks, but in this proclamation all allusions to Bulgarian aspirations and Bulgarian rights to Macedonia were carefully omitted, nor did the name of Bulgaria appear in it (see Supplement No. VIII). This flagrant fact cannot be explained away. It clearly proves how conscious the Bulgars were of the strength of the Serbian sentiment of the Macedonians.

Nations, like individuals, have their qualities. From Bulgaria's whole history, past and present, one quality, I think, emerges most clearly, and that is rapacity regarding foreign property. Only on the basis of this is it possible to explain how the Bulgars, though fully conscious that they have no right to Macedonia, nevertheless made of their State a comitadji camp whence they overran Macedonia to take it away from its true owners. And whilst from this camp the bishops, priests, teachers, agents, and banditti have, by Cross, book, money, and force of arms, duped, bought, and terrorized the Serbian people of Macedonia, Bulgarian journalists, scientists, and politicians, on the other hand, explained and protested to the world that the

Macedonians are Bulgars and dying to be united to Bulgaria!

To this comitadji-nature the Bulgars add yet another quality, and that is their positively indecent intrusiveness with all the world. This trait is very well known to all who have come in contact with Bulgars. To demonstrate this quality, we will borrow an illustration from Aleko Konstadinov, the best Bulgarian writer of short stories, who has sketched this failing of his countrymen in his "tale of the contemporary Bulgar" called "Baya Gagno," after its principal hero.[1] In this story the typical Bulgar of the present day is shown up from every point of view: as a family man, as a merchant, as a tourist in Bulgaria, and as a representative of his nation abroad; as a politician and, of course, as a patriot who on his way through Serbia does not miss the opportunity of saying to every porter and servant in Niš and Belgrade: "You are all of you Bulgars, only you call yourselves Serbs." One passage in the tale is devoted to showing how great is the Bulgarian genius for intruding. Travelling from Sofia to Prague to some festival or other, we find Baya Gagno esconced with several travelling companions in a second-class compartment (without a second-class ticket, of course). After having eaten and drunk all the provisions of the company in the compartment and repaid them "with most fervent patriotism," he begins to insinuate himself into a first-class compartment with four other occupants. "At first he came under various pretexts, such as to borrow matches, or to beg for a mouthful of brandy because he was feeling ill; but presently he became more familiar, made himself at

[1] "Baya Gagno, the Tale of a Contemporary Bulgar," by Al. Konstadinov, Sofia, 1895, pp. 25–28.

home, and did not leave our compartment any more. He had forgotten all about his former travelling companions. Of what further use were they to him? They had nothing left; all their food and drink were consumed, and we had plenty. Baya Gagno, as if out of curiosity, missed no chance of sampling all the provisions we had laid in at the stations."

"What's that? Grapes? Capital! Let's have a look, please! Give us a berry to taste. H'm! They're quite good! Capital!"

His ostensible curiosity urged him to a closer acquaintance with our food, our brandy, and our tobacco pouches.

"Is that case of Caucasian silver?" Baya Gagno's interest awoke as soon as he saw one of us about to smoke a cigarette.

"No, it was made in Vienna," replied the owner.

"Is that so? Let's have a look! Oh, oh, oh. *Do* let's have a look, please! Why, there's tobacco in it. Is it Bulgarian tobacco? Capital! Wait till I roll a cigarette. I have some cigarette-papers; if you want them, here I am."

That he was indeed *there*, we were distinctly aware of by the smell of his boots, by the specific odour of his perspiring body, and by his gradual manœuvres to occupy the whole of one seat. At first he sat at one end of the seat; then he began to seek greater comfort, and finally he obliged us to sit three on one side of the compartment, and the fourth to squeeze into one corner, so that Baya Gagno might stretch himself horizontally. We all secretly agreed to let him go on, because we were curious to know how far Baya Gagno's requirements would go. And indeed he amply satisfied our curiosity.

"Move a little farther into your corner, so that I can put up my other leg also. H'm! That's better! Capital! E-e-eh! Long may his mother be spared! Grand. . . . Listen to the engine thumping, toopa, toopa, toopa, toopa! I do like to stretch myself like this. In the other compartment the seat was too narrow. Also my companions were rather a common sort. . . . What's that you're eating? Pears, did you say? Let me see whether I can eat a pear lying down? Thanks! Where did you get them?"

"We bought them."

"Splendid!" said Baya Gagno with his mouth full. "I like pears."

Hypnotized by the monotonous thumping of the locomotive Baya Gagno fell asleep. I began to wonder how we could possibly get rid of him. Finally I was struck with an idea. I gave my companions a wink and said:

"Let's make coffee, gentlemen! Give me spirit and matches."

"Coffee, did you say?" cried Baya Gagno, and jumped from the seat as if scalded. "I'm with you there."

"How shall we make coffee without water?" asked one of us.

"Water," cried Baya Gagno, "I'm the man to fetch it. Wait a moment," and he dashed out of the compartment.

We were simply dying of laughter. Baya Gagno came back. He had to tell us how much work and trouble he had been put to for us. In his hand he carried a jug.

"Here you are. I found it. I hunted through every compartment for it. At last I caught sight of a jug and bagged it at once. A woman shouted: 'Oi! Leave

that alone, that is water for my child.' I considered what story I should tell her, and then I had an idea, and I said: 'Excuse me, madam, but somebody is feeling faint over there.' 'Indeed?' 'Yes.' 'All right, take it; only mind you give me back the jug.' Silly woman! Bah! . . . I am all perspiration. And now we shall have first-rate coffee! . . . "

Violently to seize what belongs to others—there spoke the comitadji. To force oneself upon others and to "sponge" upon them—that is Baya Gagno. In the comitadji and in Baya Gagno all Bulgarian aims and Bulgaria's programme are summed up. These aims and this programme have made of Serbian Macedonia—the Macedonian Question!

SUPPLEMENTS

I

STORY OF THE PROGRESS OF THE BULGARIAN CHURCH MOVEMENT, TOLD BY T. HADŽI MIŠEV, OF VELES.[1]

"THE citizens of Veles did not begin to take an interest in the Church struggle until 1860. It is possible that even then they might not have joined in the Church struggle but for the fact that at that time the Suffragan-Bishop of Veles was a Greek. Antim by name, known to be an overbearing man and obsequious to the Turks, who during his residence in Niš and Ruščuk had sent many persons into slavery and to the gallows, Antim the Greek made himself so unpopular in Veles and in the eparchy of Veles-Debar, that the agents of the Bulgarian propaganda won over the whole of Veles to the Church struggle for the Bulgarian Exarchate. At that time Antim annually received 300,000 groš (1 groš = twopence) from the eparchy. The citizens of Veles offered him 50,000 groš per annum purposely to get rid of him. This the Bishop did not agree to, but consulted a certain Ismail-Effendi, a wealthy and well-educated Turk who possessed great influence not only in Veles but also in the most important circles in Constantinople. Ismail-Effendi was the good friend of the old Hadži-Mišević, Djordje Hadži Drndarević, and Janko Hadži Kušević, the wealthiest merchants of Veles, who had up to that time provided the funds for the Serbian school in Veles. But as the authorities began to look upon the Serbian school with suspicion and the Bulgarian agitators were working to close it—in doing which they moreover succeeded—the three aforesaid leading citizens of Veles, believing the lies and

[1] *Todor Hadži Mišev*, born in Veles, was in his youth a very loyal Serb and a benefactor of the Serbian schools in his birthplace. He only became pro-Bulgarian after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate. He eventually became a naturalized Russian, and lived as a highly respected and wealthy merchant in Salonica, where he died in 1911.

promises of the Bulgarian propagandists, joined the ranks of the Bulgarian party and hoisted the flag of Bulgarism in Veles and in the whole eparchy of Veles-Debar.

"Therefore, when the Greek Bishop Antim came to Ismail to lodge a complaint against the Bulgarian party of Veles, asserting that they would start a rising in Veles, Ismail knew that it was simply a case of denunciation, and therefore did not take up the complaint of the Bishop. In the meantime the greater number of the inhabitants of Veles had signified to the authorities that they refused in future to recognize Antim as their Bishop. Ismail summoned Antim and advised him to subscribe £T100 (2,000 francs) to the Greek school in Veles, which was attended by Tsintsar (Macedo-Rumanian) children—there are no true Greeks in Veles—and a similar sum to the new Bulgarian school, which was attended by the Serbian children of the Bulgarian party parents. He, moreover, advised Antim to leave Veles and to go to Constantinople. Antim took his advice, and repaired to Constantinople, but the Patriarch sent him back to Veles. In the meantime a telegram from the Bulgarian representatives Čomakov and Tapšilestov arrived from Constantinople saying that the Bulgarian Church had been separated from the Greek Patriarchate. The population definitely declared before the authorities that it would no longer recognize Antim as Bishop. Antim telegraphed to Constantinople that 'a rising had taken place in Veles, blood had been shed,' etc. In Constantinople this telegram was believed, and Ahmed Pasha, Governor of Bitolj (Veles was at that time under the government of Bitolj), was ordered to proceed to Veles with his army to 'settle the rebels.' This happened in January, during the coldest part of the year. Ismail Effendi soon learnt of the impending arrival of the army, and dispatched a bey as far as six hours' walk from Veles towards Prilep to meet Ahmed Pasha. The bey made as though he did not know the reason of the Pasha's coming, and when the Pasha inquired of him about the rising the bey replied that there was no rising, and presently convinced the Pasha that the Bulgarian party of Veles were in the right and that all the Turkish citizens there were living on friendly terms with them.

"On the eve of Epiphany (January 5, 1870) Ahmed Pasha arrived in Veles. He immediately sent for the most prominent Turkish citizens, who declared that they could vouch for the leaders of the Bulgarian party as being honest and loyal men who were justified in their requests and that the real rebels were the Serbs and Tsintsars (Macedo-Roumanians) of Veles, who were siding with the Greek Bishop Antim. Such recommendation on the part of the Turks ensured the victory in the struggle to the Bulgarian party

in Veles, who on the very same day declared to Ahmed Pasha that they did not want Antim as their Bishop and that they did not recognize the Greek Patriarchate, but recognized the Bulgarian Exarchate instead, etc. The Pasha telegraphed to Constantinople that all was quiet in Veles and that the Bulgarian party was justified in its requests.

"Next morning, on St. John's Day (January 7th), the Pasha received a telegram from Constantinople to the effect that the Porte had recognized the Bulgarian Exarchate, and there was no end to the enthusiasm when the Pasha announced this intelligence to the national leaders. The Pasha then sent for Antim and reprimanded him for having sent a mendacious telegram to Constantinople. Antim was so alarmed that he signed his resignation without further ado and left at once for Constantinople.

"The Pasha was accompanied by his *Mauvim* (Sub-Pasha), the Serbian Djordje Berović of Skadar (the last of the Berović Pashas, Prince of Samos and Governor of Crete). Djordje Berović was a man of tact, who called upon the Bulgarian leaders and encouraged them in their fight with the Greek Hierarchy.

"The Pasha was given an enthusiastic send-off from Veles. The crowd accompanied him on foot for a considerable distance beyond the town. At parting, a speech was addressed to him by the lady teacher of Veles, a Serbian born in Austria and brought to Veles as a Serbian lady teacher from Prizren by Janko M. Kušević. The Pasha replied to the teacher by exhorting her to continue to instruct the children in learning and loyalty. The action of the lady teacher greatly impressed all the inhabitants of Veles, but this did not prevent them from very soon dismissing this Serbian teacher from Veles and replacing her by a Bulgarian lady teacher. This was demanded by the interests of the Bulgarian propaganda. . . . "[1]

---

[1] Iv. Ivanić, "Iz crkvene istorije Srba u Turskoj u XVIII i XIX veku" ("Church History of the Serbs in Turkey in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries"), Belgrade, 1902, pp. 90–93 (in Serbian).

II

THE STORY OF JOVAN VELJIĆ, OF DEBAR, TELLING HOW THE BULGARIAN TEACHERS MADE HIM A BULGAR BY FORCE [1]

"When in 1886 I had passed the third class of the Bulgarian Lycée in Solun and went home for a rest during the school holidays, I was taught and prompted by my professors of the Bulgarian language and of chemistry, Messrs. Popov and Kulev, and also by the Archimandrite Kozma Pričestanski to show and demonstrate to my people and others that they ought not to go on pronouncing *dj* and *ć*, but ought to pronounce *žd* and *št* instead, and that instead of saying *Kuća, vedja, sveća, Djurdjevdan, gradjanin*, etc., they ought to say *K'šta, vežda, svešta, Georgiev-dan, graždanin*, etc. And when, in obedience to a request from Mr. Draganov, another of my professors, I collected and brought to him forty national ballads from the neighbourhood of Debar, he told me that these were Serbian ballads, and, in front of me, he began to correct and to alter them according to the Bulgarian pronunciation.

"I was really grieved at the time to hear from him that the ballads from my home were Serbian, and that their language was Serbian, because at the time I was already mad with Bulgarism and with the continual impressing of Bulgarism upon me on the part of Bulgarian teachers. I was even ashamed to speak as

[1] *Mr. Jovan Veljić*, born in Debar. His family has been Serbian for generations. As there was no lycée (secondary school) in Debar, his parents sent him to study at the Bulgarian Lycée in Salonica, where students from Macedonia were boarded and educated free of charge. When his parents realized that their son would become a Bulgar in the Bulgarian school, they removed him from the latter and sent him to a Serbian school instead. He graduated at the Universities of Belgrade and Geneva. When the Serbian Lycée in Salonica was opened, he was appointed one of the professors. At present he resides in Salonica as a retired Serbian professor, and he is always mindful of his Serbian nationality.

they speak at home, and instead of saying *ja* and *će*, I always used the Bulgarian *az* and *šte*. Thus I was taught and persuaded by my Bulgarian teachers, and I hated my sweet mother-tongue and native speech. Now I can feel the purity and sweetness of my Serbian mother-tongue. When I go home I will beg my mother and father to forgive me if I have grieved them by my attempts to induce them to study Bulgarian. Now, under the influence of true teaching, I can see why they looked at me with tears in their eyes because I had lost my native speech and tried to induce them to lose it too. . . ."[1]

[1] M. V. Veselinović, "Srbi u Makedonji i u Južnoj Staroj Srbiji" ("The Serbs in Macedonia and in Southern Old Serbia"), Belgrade, 1888, pp. 7–8 (in Serbian). A similar account is given by Mr. Rista Ognjanović, of Galičnik, Professor at the Serbian Lycée in Skoplje, who also began his studies at a Bulgarian school.

III

STORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BULGARIAN PROPAGANDA IN MACEDONIA, TOLD BY A CITIZEN OF BITOLJ

"It is only thirty years ago since the Bulgarian propaganda first began. Formerly there were none but Serb and Greek schools in Old Serbia and in Macedonia. We were under the Greek Patriarchate, and we suffered much under the Greek clergy. The Bulgars speculated upon this discontent with the Greek clergy when, in commencing their struggle for the Exarchate, they endeavoured to stir up the Serbian inhabitants of our Province also. The Bulgarian agents and apostles came to us with honey on their lips and money in their pockets. They fell on our necks as 'brothers'—although we understood our 'brother' but imperfectly—and promised us an end to our troubles if we would join them in their struggle for the Exarchate.

"That we listened to the siren voices of the Bulgars must not be laid to our charge; all the world had forsaken us, and the hand of the Bulgars was the first to be stretched out to help us. Our kinsmen in Belgrade did not trouble themselves about us at all; our Serbian schools had been for the most part founded by ourselves, and only a few patriotic Serbs were prepared to act as teachers for us. Not until later, after the establishment of the Exarchate, was a school for Old-Serbian students founded in Serbia; but it was closed again after a few years.

"But there was another circumstance which greatly assisted the Bulgars in their propaganda. You know that we have become used to calling ourselves 'Bugari.' *Now this is something different from Bolgari*, but as the name signifies the same thing as 'Bulgars,' it was easy for the Bulgarian agents to persuade us that we had been Bulgars of old. It is true that *our language, our folk-songs, and history* are directly opposed to this assumption; but necessity knows no law, and so we threw ourselves into the arms of the Bulgars because nobody took our part, and because they promised us *deliverance from the Greek Church and eventually even from the Turkish domination.*

"At first the Bulgarian propaganda operated within modest limits, because it naturally did not dispose of the means at its disposal to-day. Besides this, the Greek and Serbian schools hampered its progress no less than the Greek clergy. The latter ceased to be an obstacle after the establishment of the Exarchate in 1870. The Greek priests were replaced by Bulgarian, who immediately inaugurated a brisk agitation. This naturally brought the Bulgarians a great step forward.

"In the year 1876 they made similar progress, and this likewise through the complaisance of the Turkish Government, as the latter, immediately upon the Serbian declaration of war, suspended all Serbian schools and expelled all the Serbian teachers. Obviously the Bulgars at once made the most of their opportunity and replaced the Serbian schools and teachers by Bulgarian. The fugitive Serbian teachers applied to Belgrade for help, but in vain. Otherwise the Serbian Government would at least have gained this advantage, that the teachers (who were all well known and popular with us, and whom we should have welcomed back with open arms) would have returned after the war, and continued their labours, or at least would have kept alive our sympathies for Serbia.

"Also after 1878 and until now the Serbs did not trouble about us, and left us entirely to the Bulgars, who, less indolent than the Serbs, lost no time in establishing themselves here and in Bulgarizing the people.

"At the head of the whole propaganda stands the Bulgarian Exarch in Constantinople, assisted by his Secretary, Šopov (Ofeikoff). He devotes *£T30,500 (nearly 700,000 francs)* annually solely to propaganda purposes. Besides this, the Bulgarian Sobranje decided, immediately upon the foundation of the Bulgarian Principality, to provide in their Budget 400,000 francs annually for the erection and maintenance of Bulgarian schools in our countries, and Eastern Roumelia decided to devote 60,000 francs annually to the same object. To-day united Bulgaria spends fully 600,000 francs annually upon the Bulgarian schools in Macedonia and Old Serbia. In addition to this the Bulgarian Government annually assigns *over 2,000,000 francs* from the Treasury for propaganda work. If this appears incredible to you, consult the Bulgarian Budget. There you will find that the Foreign Ministry annually receives 2,800,000 francs, although it has neither Embassies nor Consulates to maintain. The Serbian Foreign Ministry only receives 800,000 francs per annum (of which 100,000 are Treasury funds), out of which it has to maintain ten Legations and four Consulates-General. Consequently the

Bulgarian Foreign Minister has at least 2,400,000 francs at his disposal with which to carry on the agitation here, and to bribe the European Press as well as individual authors. At first Russia also provided annual assistance; I believe that since 1885 this is no longer paid, but I may be wrong. Suffice it to say *that the Bulgarian Government and the Exarchate in all* expend 3,700,000 francs on propaganda work each year.

* * * * * *

"I have mentioned above that the Bulgarian Church is the mainspring of the propaganda, and its focus. For a better understanding I must add that it is the *Porte itself*—unintentionally, of course—that drove and still compels the Exarchate to propaganda.

"When the Exarchate was instituted it embraced, *inter alia*, *five* Bishoprics in the Danubian Bulgarian region and *eight* in Old Serbia! Of these eight, viz. Sofija, Vrača, Vidin, Niš, Pirot, Čustendil, Samokov, and Veles, the five last mentioned had previously belonged to the Serbian Patriarchate of Peć; it therefore points to a boundless stupidity on the part of the Porte, or to gross venality on the part of the then Grand-Vizier, that at the very outset Serbian territory was to be handed over to the Bulgars.

"But this was not enough! Article 10 of the firman in question distinctly declares that those eparchies whose inhabitants unanimously, or even by a two-thirds majority, demanded it, should be incorporated with the Exarchate.

"Hereby the Porte itself naturally opened bolt and bars to the Exarchate. All of us Slavs were discontented with the Greek clergy; the prospect of hearing divine service in hierarchic Slav did the rest; and so the Bulgarian apostles had an easy task when they came to our village and collected signatures.

"Scarcely was the Exarchate established than the agitation was begun in Ochrida and Skoplje. The Turkish Commission, which was to ascertain the wish of the people, everywhere found a desire for the Exarchate, a suitable *baksheesh* did the rest—in short, already in 1872 Bulgarian bishops were appointed for Ochrida and Skoplje!

"At that time the Porte lived in constant fear of the plots and intrigues of Serbia and Greece, while the Bulgarians appeared to them as harmless *raja* (slaves). This explains the benevolence with which the Porte regarded Bulgarian intrigues. The poor dear little dreamt in its simplicity that the Bulgars would one day become far more dangerous foes than Serbs and Greeks put together. (And even to-day, after so many experiences, the Turks underrate the political intrigue of the Bulgars, and fear Serbia, who has been rendered quite harmless.)

"The shameless Bulgarian agitation tempted not the Serbs, as might have been assumed, but the Greeks to a counter-stroke. The Greek Patriarch convened an Assembly of the Church, which proclaimed the Bulgarian clergy and their adherents 'heretics.' The Bulgars of course lodged a protest against this finding, and the dispute is not settled to this day.

"The events of 1876 caused the Porte to cancel Article 10 and to depose the Bishops of Skoplje and Ochrida. Since then the Bulgars have left no stone unturned to prevail upon the Porte to restore Article 10 and to re-appoint the Bishops of Skoplje and Ochrida. But it seems that even the Sublime Porte has at last begun to smell a rat, because the *berats* (appointments) of the Bishops have not yet been drawn up.

"The Exarchate revenged itself in 1880 by declaring the Parish School Boards in Macedonia and Old Serbia its representatives, and establishing a special 'School Department' (*školsko popečiteljstvo*) in the Exarchate. It is this School Department which maintains and governs the Bulgarian schools in our country, and if you bear in mind the incredible activity of the Bulgars and their unanimity when it is a question of the idea of a Great Bulgaria, you can imagine how firmly rooted the propaganda is to-day.

"Side by side with the lawful Greek Bishops the Bulgars have set up their own ecclesiastic authorities which counteract the activity of the former and render it illusory. In Ochrida, Skoplje, Debar, Veles, Bitolj, and Salonica the Bulgarians have appointed rural deans[1] (*protojereji*) with excellent salaries. Every dean has his Council, which attends to Church and school matters, and thus these deans perform all the functions of bishops without assuming the title. The Greek Bishops, whom they simply override, are powerless against them. Furthermore, the deans have all the ecclesiastic and disciplinary power over the clergy in their hands. In Salonika, for instance, this office had been entrusted to the Archimandrite Kozeljev.

"Each dean is also provided with a deputy (*namestnik*), who may also be a layman (lit. a member of the bourgeoisie). He is a member of the Church School Council and assistant of the dean, especially in his correspondence with the parishes concerned. The deputies are paid by the Church School Council of the locality in which the dean resides.

"Where there are intermediary schools, their director and the governors also belong to the Church School Council.

"Only a few of the adherents of Greece and Serbia offer any

[1] Lit. archpresbyter.

resistance to the Bulgarian propagandists. The former consist first of all of such as know that we are not Bulgars but Serbs, and who are swayed by their national sentiment; and secondly, of such who feel spiritually bound to Serbia by our folk-songs, or in whom the memory of the former Serbian rule here has been kept alive by tradition, and finally by such as have been to Serbia, or go there year by year to work.

"The adherents of Greece consist of Greek or Hellenized persons or enemies of Bulgarism. As a rule they go hand in hand with the adherents of Serbia."[1]

---

[1] S. Gopčević, "Makedonien und Alt-Serbien," Wien, 1889, pp. 307–311.

IV

PETITIONS ADDRESSED BY MACEDONIANS TO MILAN PRINCE OF SERBIA AND TO THE CONGRESS OF BERLIN, PRAYING TO BE UNITED WITH SERBIA

A

FROM the districts of Kičevo, Prilep, and Veles, with the signatures of 170 mayors, priests, archimandrites, etc., appended and bearing the seals of 44 communes. The petition is headed:—

"The following was resolved upon at the meeting on Mount Babuna, May 10, 1878," and addressed to Prince Milan. It is worded as follows:—

"A short time ago the Čorbadži (notables) of our city, who, together with the Turks, have fleeced us ever since Kosovo, informed us that we are to fall under the domination of a *Bulgarian* realm, *as if we were not true and pure Serbs, but some kind of Bulgars*!

"All of us, Illustrious Prince, in the *nahijas* (districts) of Skoplje, Tetovo, Debar, Kičevo, Veles, Prilep, Bitolj, Kostur, Gorica, Solun, Seres, Tikveš, Ištip, Radovište, Nevrokop, Melnik, Kočani, Kratovo, Kumanovo, Banjska, Radomir, Sofija, Kriva Palanka, Samokov, Dupnica, etc, are *true Serbs of true Serb stock*. This is proved by the innumerable exclusively purely Serbian remains to be found in all the said *nahijas* (districts).

"We have but to look around to see in the said districts our Metropolitan Church of St. Sava in Debar; the Church of the Blessed Mother of God and the Holy Archangel (Sv. Bogorodica, Sv. Arangjel) in Prilep, both founded by Kings *Milutin* and Marko; St. Jovan Slepčevački and St. Nikolas in Prilep, also the Sv. Bogorodica (Blessed Mother of God) and St. Nikolas in Prilep, all founded by King Dečanski; St. Jovan, St. Naum, and Čista Prečista in Ochrida, founded by the Kings Vojislav and Vladimir; St. Nikola Toplički in Bitolj, founded by *Milan Toplica*; St. Dimitrije in Skoplje, founded by King Vukašin; SS. Andrija and Vasilije, founded by King Andrejaš; St. Jovan's in Palanka (containing the grave of Despot George of Smederevo), founded by King Dragutin; St. Nikola's and the Archangel, Sv. Bogorodica and Spas in Ištip,

founded by King Dečanski; the tomb of the Blessed *Nemanjići* in Kratovo; that of *Relja Krilatica* in Rilo; Nemanica, the home of the Nemanjići; St. Dimitrije in Veles, founded by Zupan *Stracimir*, brother of Nemanja; St. Pantelija's in Kočani, founded by *St. Simeon Nemanja*; St. Antana's in Tetovo, founded by Car Lazar; SS. Jovan and Gjorgje in Debrica, founded by Kings *Radoslav* and *Milutin*; Sv. Čista Prečista and Presveta Bogorodica in Kičevo, founded by Kings *Milutin* and *Dragutin*; Sv. Presveta Bogorodica Devica (Most Holy Virgin Mother of God), founded by King *Uroš the Great*, besides many others not mentioned in each *nahija*, as well as the ruins of hundreds of monasteries and churches built by Serbian Kings and Tsars. Our assertion is further proved by the relics of our sainted kings and tsars and other Serbian saints such as King Milutin in Sofija; King Vladimir in Elbasan; St. Naum in Ochrida; St. Prohor in Kumanovo, St. Jakim in Palanka, St. Gavril in Kratovo, the Holy King in Gjakovica (follows a further list of saints).

"We therefore send to you, in the names of the entire districts of Kičevo, Veles, and Prilep, our accredited agents Hadži Trajković Mincik, Gj—— N—— and A—— D——, and on our knees implore Your Serene Highness, Our August King, that you will unite us together with our native land with Holy Mother Serbia, so that we may at last emerge from our bondage and become *men* and a useful member of the people of Europe; *but not to let us exchange the harsh Turkish yoke for the still harsher and blacker Bulgarian servitude*, which will be harder, more oppressive, and more unendurable to us than the Turkish which we have endured hitherto, and would leave us no way of avenging ourselves for this wrong, save either to slay our whole households or to forsake our sacred soil, our churches and graves, and all that we hold dear, the which will profit neither Europe nor our own nation."

B.

Petition addressed to Prince Milan, signed by 520 Parish Councils, etc., from the districts of *Kumanovo*, *Kratovo*, *Palanka*, *Ištip*, *Petrić*, *Strumica*, and *Kočani*, with the seals of 220 communes affixed, drawn up on June 2nd, 1878, at Kozjak:—

"Having heard that we, after having so lavishly shed our blood in concert with our brothers of Serbia in the struggle against our hereditary enemy the Turk, are yet to remain under Turkish rule, unless we subscribe to a Russo-Bulgaria, we on our knees implore Your Highness, our only lawful, Gracious Sovereign, that you will unite us with our mother country. For *we are Serbs* in the districts

of Kumanovo, Skoplje, Banjska, Radomir, Melnik, Nevrokop, Kratovo, Ištip, Kočani, Strumica, Veles, etc., and that of the purest and best Old Serbian stock, *and our country is the most purely Serbian, even the very heart of Serbia*, from which have sprung not only our sainted Nemanjići, but also our State and our literature, renown, power, and greatness, and *all that was and still is Serbian.*

"This is proved to this day by hundreds of complete and thousands of ruined churches and monasteries, more especially by the following ancient buildings: In Matejče, the Church of the Blessed Mother (Sv. Bogorodica), where King *Milutin* was crowned; St. Gjuragj Nagoricki, the foundation of King *Milutin*, built in gratitude for the salvation of Serbia and Europe from the Tartar invasion; Sv. Bogorodica Zabelska, founded by Stephan Nemanja; Sv. Bogorodica Korminska, founded by Kings *Radoslav* and *Dragutin*; Sv. Otac Prohor Pčinjski (Blessed Father Prohor of Pčinja), founded by Car Lazar; St. Jaćim Osogovski, founded by King *Dragutin*; Sv. Bogorodica Rilska (Our Lady of Rilo), founded by King *Dečanski*; St. Gavril Lesnovski, founded by the Despot *Jovan Oliver*, etc.[1]

"It is further proved by the many episcopal sees and Metropolitanates founded by St. Sava, such as those in Moravica, Ćustendil, Samokov, Bregalnica, Morozvižd, and many other, of which the records are still extant.

"Lastly, it is proved by our Old Serbian speech, preserved in all its purity, the tongue in which the kings and tsars of Serbia conversed; it is proved by our ancient Serbian customs, dress, etc., and by much else as well, that we are Serbs, and naught else.

"We, the undersigned, being pure Serbs of true Serbian stock of the most ancient and purest of Serbian territories, yet once more implore Your Highness on our knees by any means to deliver us from our bondage of five centuries, and to incorporate us with your principality of Serbia. Otherwise the inhabitants of *Kumanovo*, *Palanka*, and *Kratovo*, having fought shoulder to shoulder with their brothers of Serbia against their mortal foe the Turk, may not dare to thrust their heads again beneath the yoke, but would rather slay themselves with all their households.

"In the names of all the undersigned, we authorize B—— P——, merchant; V—— C——, peasant; V—— C——, P—— D——, P—— P——, and Petar Mitrović."[2]

---

[1] The foundations mentioned in the previous petition have been omitted here.

[2] The names of living persons, especially those of any of the signatories, are obviously withheld, for fear of exposing their owners to the vengeance of the Turks and Bulgars.

C

Petition addressed to the *British Consul* at Vranje, as *Envoy of the Berlin Congress*, signed in Vranje, on June 11, 1878, by twenty natives of Gilane (from the towns and villages of Gilane, Pasijan, Petrovac, Ranilug, Ropotovo, Domorovac, Kufedže, Koretište, Stanišor, Budrig, Parteš, Grizimi, Močar, Miganovac, and Businac) :—

"The compassionate and humane disposition of Your Majesty gives us, your obedient servants, the undersigned, courage on our knees to implore you and your Government to take pity upon us and to rescue us from the horrible position in which we are placed, and *at the same time to unite us with our brothers in the Principality of Serbia*, from whom we have been separated for five hundred years." (Here follow complaints that sympathy is extended to the grievances of the Bulgars and other peoples enslaved by the Turks, while the unhappy Serbs of Old Serbia are ignored in spite of their great sufferings. Moreover a list is given of all murders and other outrages, excesses lately committed by the Turks.)

The petition concludes:—

"We therefore most humbly pray your Government to free us from our fetters and bonds and *to unite us with our Serbian brothers*, the end that the sun of Justice and Freedom may arise for us also, wherefore we should be eternally grateful to you. In this joyful hope we sign for the inhabitants of Gilane." [1]

(*Here follow the signatures.*)

D

Petition of 500 distinguished citizens, archimandrites, priests, teachers, mayors, etc., of the districts of *Kičevo*, *Ochrida*, *Debar*, and *Elbasan*, with the seals of 308 communes affixed, dated from the Monastery of Čista Prečista in Skrzava at the Sabor (meeting) of June 15, 1878, and addressed to the "King" of Serbia:—

"We have heard that by the treaty of San Stefano we are to become subject to a Bulgarian realm and that our native land

[1] This petition is in so far interesting as the population of Gilane is known to be of Serbian *Catholic* origin.

of Old Serbia is henceforth to be called 'Bulgaria.' *Since we neither are Bulgars, nor ever were Bulgars, and not a single Bulgar is resident among us*—with the exception of the Bulgarian bishops and teachers who have been forced upon us by the Turkish Government—we *as Serbs* appeal to you our only Sovereign and Lord, and beg you save us from this calamity and, as *purest Serbs of the truest and best Serbian stock*, to unite us with your principality of Serbia, our only mother and solace.

"That we of the districts of Kičevo, Debar, Ochrida, Elbasan, etc., *are purest Serbs of truest Serbian stock* is proved not only by our purely Serbian speech, but by those whom you and we worship, even our Saints and holy relics, such as . . ." (Here again follows a list of the relics of the Serbian Kings Vladimir and Petroslav, as also of those of the Serbian SS. Clement, Naum, and Ilarion, who are buried in those parts of Old Serbia.)

"It is further proved by the former capitals of our sainted kings, viz. Prespa, the capital of our holy King Petroslav; Ochrida, Beograd and Čemernik, where King Vladimir had his residence; Papradnica (now Kodžadžik), the capital of King Vojislav; the ruins of the residence of King Gjuragj on the Gjuragj Planina Hills; the archiepiscopal sees of our Serbian rulers before St. Nemanja in Biskupštica below the Gjuragj Planina; the ruins of the cathedrals of *Debrca* and *Budim* (in Kostur), founded by St. Sava; the foundations of King Milutin, viz. St. Gjuragj Orašački and St. George's (above Kičevo).

"It is further proved by the monasteries which have been preserved complete, such as St. Jovan Šlepčev (Bitolj), founded by King Dečanski; Sv. Bogorodica in Poreč and on the Babuna, founded by King Uroš the Great; Sv. Bogorodica Zlatovrh Treskavačka and Sv. Arangjel (the Blessed Mother of God and the Archangel) in Bučim, founded by King Milutin; Sv. Bogorodica near Bitolj, St. Ilija near Hlerin, and St. Gjuragj near Gjavat, founded by our Nemanja Tsars; Sv. Bogorodica above Kostur, founded by St. Sava; St. Ilija above Kostur, and twenty-four monasteries at Meteora, founded by the sainted Nemanjici; St. Peter's above Beograd, founded by King Petroslav; the Holy Archangel's in Prilep, founded by King Marko; Sv. Bogorodica of Zrze, founded by King Vukašin; the two monasteries of Ćista Prećista (above Struga and above Kičevo) and Sv. Bogorodica (above Ochrida), all three founded by King Vladimir, etc., etc.

"Hence we pay our respects to you in the name of all our sainted Kings and Tsars, and of the whole Serbian population of to-day in the regions aforesaid, begging you to liberate us and take us under the wing of your protection and *unite us with your*

principality of Serbia failing which we will all perish, *for we never have lived with the Bulgars, and cannot so live. In that case we would rather continue to remain under the four centuries' long domination of the Turks, under whom we shall at least be able to preserve our nationality, our language, and our faith.*"

E

Petition addressed to the British Consul (Envoy of the Berlin Congress), dated Gilane, June 18, 1878, and signed by 875 distinguished inhabitants from the districts of *Gilane*, *Skoplje*, and *Tetovo*. A footnote accounts for the absence of parish seals by explaining that plundering Circassians and Albanians had taken them away. The petition runs as follows:—

"Several weeks ago we presented a petition to His Highness the Prince of Serbia, showing *that we have been Serbs of old and always shall be Serbs*; that this is proved by our customs, folk-songs, habits, dress, speech, and the numerous monasteries and churches founded by Serbian rulers and to be met with at every step in our country.

"Therefore we raised our voices in protest against those *who would persuade us that we are Bulgars*, falsely declaring that our land was once Bulgarian, and we begged His Highness that we being true Serbs of his, he would deliver us from servitude and take us under the protection of the beneficent Serbian laws and receive us into the bosom of our free brothers. We also demonstrated that the Serbian element in the districts of Gilane, Priština, Skoplje, and Tetovo far outnumbers that of the renegade Albanians, and we have enumerated the most recent outrages committed by the Turks."

(Here the native hope is expressed that Europe, having inscribed the device "Freedom and Progress" upon her banner, will take pity also upon the Christians who are being oppressed by the Turks, and create decent conditions, and worthy of humanity, which would guarantee the peace of Europe. Thence it was expected of the Congress of Berlin that it would give the Serbian army the mandate as soon as possible to occupy Gilane, Skoplje, Tetovo, and Priština, whereby the atrocities of the Turks would be brought to an end.

A long list of these outrages follows. The conclusion is formed by the request to submit the petition to the Congress.)

F

Petition to the "King" of Serbia, dated Skoplje, June 20, 1878, with the seals of more than 50 communes affixed. Nobody had dared to sign, as of the signatories to the Božinče petition 250 had been arrested in Skoplje alone, of whom only 50 had come out of prison alive. In the face of such intimidation it is truly amazing that the mayors of 50 communes yet had courage to affix their seals. The petition runs:—

"Having heard that under the terms of peace we are to come under a Bulgarian State, *as if we were Bulgars and not pure Serbs of true Serbian stock*, we on our knees implore you not to consent to let us *pure and true Serbs* fall into Bulgarian bondage. *We were never under Bulgarian rule; we never were nor ever can be Bulgars. We citizens of Skoplje are of the purest and best Serbian stock*, as also are the inhabitants of the districts of Tetovo, Debar, Kičevo, Prilep, Ištip, Veles, Kratovo, Kočani, Kumanovo, Palanka, Banjska, etc. Our pure Old Serbian speech, the speech of our Kings and Tsars, our customs, usages, dress, songs, etc., bear this out. Equally it is borne out by the ancient Serbian buildings in our country, viz. the Holy Archangel and Ilija's on the Karadag, founded by Stephan Nemanja; the Holy Archangel and Blessed Mother of God (Sv. Arangjel and Bogorodica), founded by Uroš the Infant; St. Nikita's in Čučar, founded by King Mulutin; Sv. Bogorodica (Blessed Mother of God) in Ljubinac, founded by the sister of Tsar Dušan, St. Dimitrije in Sušica, where the Kings Vukašin and Marko are buried; St. Vasilje, founded by King Andrejaš, and containing his tomb; St. Pantelija's in Poreč, founded by Nemanja; St. Andrija's, founded by and containing the tomb of Queen Simonida; St. Athanasije in Lešav, founded by Tsar Lazar.

"It is further proved by our city of Skoplje, once the capital of Serbia; by the ruins of Kačanik, the stronghold of Starina Novak." (Here follows a list of numerous ruined castles famous in connection with Serbian heroes and of sundry Metropolitan sees, etc.)

"It is further borne out by many documentary monuments of our past and literary history, all penned in this heart, centre, navel, and storehouse of true and pure Serbia.

"We therefore beseech you on our knees to save us from other, harsher and more cruel oppressors and assassins, who are worse than the Turks, and have already under the Turkish rule oppressed

us through their bishops and teachers, have threatened and destroyed our *language*, our *Slava*, our *nationality*, and *Serbian antiquities*. Unite us as soon as possible with your principality of Serbia, otherwise we shall be left no choice but to emigrate or to *perish in the conflict with the Bulgars*."

G

Petition to the *Berlin Congress* dated "On the Gjerman Planina, July 1, 1878," bearing 800 signatures and the seals of 196 communes and monasteries from the districts of Kumanovo, Kratovo, Kočani, and Palanka. (An almost identical but far more explicit petition, bearing 850 signatures and 145 seals, was presented to the Prince of Serbia.)

" Several weeks ago we, in concert with the inhabitants of the Štip district, petitioned H.H. Our Gracious Lord and King Milan Obrenović IV that, *we being pure Serbs of true Serb stock, he would take us under his protection and unite our true Serbian land, in which the Serbian Kings have lived and laboured and made their graves, with his Principality, and not permit us to be transferred to the Bulgars, whose language and customs are alien to us. For neither will we live together with the Bulgars nor have our fathers done so.* We could never form one people with the Bulgars, *for we are pure Serbs of old*, and naught else. In our petition we proved that we are truly pure and genuine Serbs, seeing that . . ." (Here all the ecclesiastic foundations, ancient buildings, etc., are all enumerated as in the previous petition.) " Our contention is also borne out by our speech, habits, and customs, which differ greatly from those of the Bulgars, and furthermore by our ancient mints where Serbian money was minted, especially that in the village of Perperi, and by our mines which are so famous in Serbian history.

" But we received no answer to our petition!

" The best proof that it is not possible for us under any circumstances to live under either the Bulgars or the Turks is to be found in the fact that the inhabitants who fled from forty villages in the district of Palanka do not dare to return to their homes because since the retirement of the Serbian army these have been occupied by the Turks and Bulgars."

(Here follows the definition of the conditions under which Mihail Abogović, the last Despot of this region, surrendered in 1459 to the Turks, who, however, disregarded the terms of the treaty.) After

further complaints concerning the grievous plight of the people, the petition proceeds :—

"If help is not soon forthcoming, no trace will be left of us ere long." (Here follow renewed requests for incorporation with Serbia, with urgent representations to *Bismarck* personally and an appeal for a *European Commission* to investigate the true state of affairs and the atrocities committed by the Turks.)

"This Commission will convince itself of the truth of our statements, for we do not dare to *lie like our step-brothers the Bulgars, who have deceived our Russian and Serbian brothers*, maintaining that the Sandžaks of Vidin, Sofija, and Ćustendil are inhabited by Bulgars."

(Then follows a long catalogue of all recent excesses, outrages murders, etc., committed by the Turkish troops. The names of several hundred Serbs who had been ill-used or murdered by the Turks are given, with the names of the villages concerned and occasionally those of the guilty Turkish officers and men. The names of several hundred violated girls, women and children are also published, together with the names of many Turks who were guilty of these outrages. It is a heart-rendering and revolting account, which, needless to say, made no impression upon the dried-up diplomats of the Berlin Congress.)

V

INCOMPLETE LIST OF BULGARIAN ATTACKS UPON SERBIAN SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS IN MACEDONIA

1. On the opening day of the Serbian school in Dobruševo (county of Bitolj) the Bulgars of Bitolj assaulted the peasants who had assembled at the school. On that occasion the teacher, Andjelko Trajković, was twice fired at with a rifle.

2. In Kičevo they likewise attacked the school and assaulted the Serbian citizens.

3. In Ochrida they beat the Serbian teacher Djordje Tasić, and L. Stavrić, a Serbian bookseller.

4. In Kumanovo the Serbian church and school were attacked times without number. There were frequent instances of bloodshed. In one assault upon the Serbian school five Serbs were wounded.

5. In Gostivar the Bulgars attacked the Serbian church one Christmas Day with the intention of seizing it from the Serbs. The Bulgars discharged their revolvers inside the church and beat the Serbs.

6. On the occasion of the opening of the Serbian school in Veles, the Bulgars assaulted the Serbs and beat them in the streets.

7. In Kukuš they wrecked and looted the Serbian school, and beat the teacher Jovan Jovićević so severely that he all but died.

8. In Zubovac they attacked the Serbian school and wounded the teacher, Josip Bradić.

9. In Gornje Todoraćevo (district of Kukuš) they attacked and looted the Serbian church.

10. In Prilep the Bulgars planned a great attack upon the Serbs *en masse*, but it was discovered and frustrated by the police.

11. On the occasion of the opening of the Serbian school in Bitolj in 1897 the Bulgars attacked the school. The police with difficulty succeeded in dispersing the aggressors and in arresting some of them. But the attacks were repeated, and in one of them a Bulgarian professor wounded Gjura Vojvedić, student at the Serbian Lycée.

12. In Kruševo the Bulgars assaulted two Serbian female teachers in 1899, Olga Vukojević and Zlata Krstićka. The latter fell ill from shock and all but died.

13. In Skoplje the Serbian schools, teachers, and students were attacked countless times. On Christmas Day, 1899, and in April and in December 1900 the Bulgars assaulted the teachers and pupils of the Girls' High School. They beat them, pulled out their hair, and otherwise ill-used them.

14. In Tetovo the Bulgars attacked the Serbian school and citizens on the Feast of St. Sava, the Serbian patron saint, January 14, 1900.

15. In Čelopek they set fire to the Serbian school in 1901.[1]

---

[1] Iv. Ivanić, "Iz Crkvene Istorije Srba u Turskoj" ("Church History of the Serbs in Turkey in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries"), Belgrade, 1902, pp. 90–98. Iv. Ivanić, "Makedonija" ("Macedonia"), Novi Sad, 1908, pp. 470–474.

INCOMPLETE LIST OF SERBS MURDERED BY THE BULGARS OR AGENTS OF THE BULGARIAN COMMITTEE IN MACEDONIA BETWEEN 1881 AND 1909.

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
1	Spira Crnčević ...	—	Prilep	1881	—
2	Cvetko Popović ...	Schoolmaster	Lukovo (Drimkol)	1886	—
3	Stojan Krstić ...	Priest	Podgorac (near Struga)	1890	—
4	Anta N.	Priest	Stara Nagoričino	1893	—
5	Jovan Duškić ...	Schoolmaster	Lukovo	1893	—
6	Gerasim Pandinović	Peasant	Zubovac	1894	—
7	Blaža Popović ...	Priest	Grešnica (Poreč)	1896	—
8	Naca Delović ...	Peasant	Bojmica	1896	—
9	Son of Petar Kanović	Peasant	Gorlop	1896	—
10	Ilija Pejčinović ...	Professor	Struga	1897. Salonica	Knifed and shot with revolver
11	Anka P. Dimitrijević	Daughter of Serbian school head master	Prilep	1897. Prilep	Shot with revolver
12	Dimitrije Grdanović	Proprietor of Serbian school	Ochrida; b. 1841	1897, Aug. 5th. Ochrida	Knifed and shot with revolver
13	Dušan Ristić ...	Peasant	Berislav	1897, Sept.	Body found badly mutilated
14	Gjorgje Gelević ...	Peasant	Armensko	1897, Oct.	—

15	Krsta Pejović ...	Schoolmaster	Gostivar	1897, Dec. 5th. Gostivar	Knifed and shot with revolver
16	Stojče Jančević ...	Prominent citizen	Sehovo	1897. Sehovo	—
17	Koča Dudević ...	Peasant	Gorgopi	1897	—
18	Rista Naumović-Cica	Head master of Serbian school	Gjevgjelija	1898. Gjevgjelija	Knifed and shot with revolver
19	Rista	Priest	Prebudište	1898, March 28th	—
20	Andreja Vangjelović	Member of Serbian town council	Debar; resident in Salonica	1898, June. Salonica	Shot with revolver
21	Naum Srbinovoć ...	Serbian headman	Kozičina-Kičevo District	1898. Kičevo	Knifed and shot with revolver
22	Petar Tasević ...	Serbian headman	Bašino Selo	1898. Veles	Knifed and shot with revolver
23	Hadži Jezikilj ...	Monk	Lesok Monastery	1898. Lesok	Shot with revolver
24	Stijan Vučević ...	Priest	Leskovo	1898, July 28th	—
25	Son of Priest Nikolas	Student at Serbian Lycée in Salonica	Stojakovo	1898, Aug. 30th. Stojakovo	Knifed
26	Dedo Kole	Peasant	Konjsko	1898, Oct. Majadala	—
27	Rista Stojanović ...	Peasant	Berislav	1898, Oct.	—
28	Cvetan Jačianović ...	Serbian headman	Veternica	1898, Dec. Veternica	Cut to pieces
29	Jovan...	Priest	Patoroz	1898	—
30	Tanasije Stojković ...	Peasant	Selovo	1898	—
31	Delja Topal-Petković	Peasant	Martolenci	1898	—
32	Delja Ganović ...	A wealthy man	Gjevgjelija	1898	—
33	Jovan Gjehaja ...	Peasant	Bojmica	1898	—
34	Todor Pop-Antić ...	Serbian bookseller	Prilep	1898, Jan. Prilep	Killed with hatchet
35	Janja Nikolić ...	Serbian priest	Patoroz	1899. Patoros	Shot
36	Toma Jovanović ...	Merchant of independent means	Skoplje	1899, April 10th. Skoplje	Knifed

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
37	Delja	Serbian priest	Grčište	1899, April 10th	Knifed and shot with revolver
38	Stanko Kočević ...	Peasant	Grušina	1898, Sept. Grušina	—
39	Jovan Maksimović ...	Serbian vicar	Krstovo	1899, Oct. Krstovo	Brained with hatchet
40	Ico Ristić	Peasant	Berislav	1899, Oct. 28th	—
41	Grigorije Hadži-Dimitrijević	Member of Serbian town council	Dojran	1899, Nov. 18th. Surlovo	Shot at night
42	Mita Cjeletović ...	Serbian headman	Veles	1899, Nov. Veles	Knifed
43	Rista Frendžević ...	Peasant	Gorlopi	1899, Dec.	—
44	Stevan	Priest	Mirovci	1899, Dec. 1st	—
45	Hadži Stojan Čakmaković	Inland Revenue Official	Jenidže	1899, Dec. 15th	—
46	Jeftimije Stefanović	Serbian priest	Nivičane	1899, Christmas. Nivičane	Shot outside church with revolver
47	Rista Kostić-Malezan	Serbian headman	Orahovac	1900, Jan. 4th	Shot from an ambush in the street
48	Gjorgje Jovičić ...	Peasant	Nikuljane	1900, Jan. Nikuljane	—
49	Marija Hadži-Antonović	Female teacher	Vladovo	1900, Feb. 24th	—
50	Dimko Petrušević ...	Serbian headman	Orahovac	1900, March 10th. Orahovac	—
51	Dimitrije Marković...	Dean	Kočani	1900, May 22nd	Murdered and thrown into river

52	Brother of Priest Aleksa	Peasant	Robovo (Maleš)	1900, June. Maleš	Cut to pieces
53	Rista Sapundžijević	Peasant	Dobrovani	1900, June 30th	—
54	Nedeljko Pop-Jovanović	Peasant	Vraštu	1900, July	—
55	Gjorgje Pop-Jovanović	Peasant	Vraštu	1900, July	—
56	Nastas Pop-Jovanović	Peasant	Vraštu	1900, July	—
57	Trajko Stojčević ...	Peasant	Mesimer	1900, July 12th	In the village
58	Wife of Priest Aleksa	—	Robovo (Maleš)	1900, Nov. 24th	Cut to pieces
59	Priest Aleksin's daughter-in-law	—	Robovo (Maleš)	1900, Nov. 24th	Cut to pieces
60	Two children of murdered brother of Priest Aleksa	—	Robovo (Maleš)	1900, Nov. 24th	Cut to pieces
61	Petar	Teacher	Vladimirovo	1900, Nov.	Knifed
62	Dimitrije Bojanović-Kačević	Teacher	Lešok	1900. Caribrod	Shot with revolver
63	Nedeljko Nenadović	Prominent citizen	Bituša (Bitolj Villayet)	1900. Bituša	Murdered by Stojev's comitadjis
64	Stojan Ilijević ...	Herdman	Rufci	1900	Murdered by Stojev's comitadjis
65	Ande Bošković ...	Serbian headman	Orahov Dol	1900, Dec. 6th	Shot with rifle
66	Arsenije Nikolajević	Serbian priest	Jablanica	1901, Feb. 21st. Bezevo	Shot with rifle
67	Partenije	Archimandrite	Sopotnica	1901, April	Beaten to death with sticks and thrown into river
68	Petar Konstantinović	Superintendent of Serbian schools	Zrze (Prilep)	1901, April	Shot with revolver
69	Stojan Techarović ...	Peasant	Asanovo	1901, April 22nd	—
70	Rista Filipović ...	Prominent landowner	Gornjane	1901, June 21st	Shot with rifle

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
71	Nephew of Priest Nikola	Farm labourer	Vrbjani	Vrbjani	—
72	Wife of Steva (Angja)	—	Leskovac	1901. Leskovac	—
73	Janko Corbadži ...	Peasant	Cerovo	1901, Nov. 7th	—
74	Marko Trajković ...	Peasant	Dobroveni	1901, Nov. 8th	—
75	Nako Jovković ...	Peasant	Cerovo	1901, Nov. 21st	—
76	Vanče	Prominent Serbian	Belica	1901, Nov. 25th. Near Negočani	—
77	Toma Bredović ...	Café-keeper	Kruševo	1901, Dec. 1st. Prilep	—
78	Alče	Farm labourer	Krušorat	1901, Dec. 10th	—
79	Steva	Farm labourer	Vrbjani	1901, Dec. 28th. Vakufcej	—
80	Asaman	Peasant	Kostenci	1901	—
81	Vasilije Camanović...	Peasant	Dubjani	1901	—
82	Lazar Kiljević ...	Peasant	Konomlati	1901	—
83	Aleksa	Priest	Robovo	1901	—
84	Petar Sopa	Peasant	Kontoroj	1901	—
85	Dimitrije Čonović ...	Merchant	Bitolj	1902, Jan. 18th. Trnovo	—
86	Stojan Stojčević ...	Priest	Mesimer	1902, Jan. 17th	—
87	Gjorgje Patriot ...	Prominent citizen; well-known patriot	Dojran	1902, March 18th. Dojran	Previously wounded in 1900
88	Živko Kacanović ...	Herdman	Trnovo	1902, June. Capar	—

89	Petar Gjošević ...	Peasant	Crna-Reka	1902, June 6th	—
90	Dimitrije Dačević ...	Peasant	Crna-Reka	1902, June 6th. In a field	Throat cut
91	Jaša Buroabakić ...	Member of village council	Kruševo	1902, June. In a field	—
92	Rista Stojanović ...	Peasant	Dobroveni	1902, July 9th	—
93	Jovan Grm	Verger	Drama District	1902, July 16th	—
94	Jovan Bakarčević ...	Peasant	Vladovo	1902, Aug. 8th. In the village	—
95	Jovan Gacović ...	Farm labourer	Barovica	1902, Aug. 11th	—
96	Gjorgje Trocković ...	Peasant	Prosjecin	1902, Sept. 17th	—
97	Jovan Kulaković ...	Farm labourer	Cajirli	1902, Oct. 12th. Cajirli	Cut to pieces
98	Jovan Kulaković (brother)	Farm labourer	Cajirli	1902, Oct. 12th. Cajirli	Cut to pieces
99	Wives of the Kulaković brothers	—	Cajirli	1902, Oct. 12th. Cajirli	Cut to pieces
100	Rista Dojčinović ...	Peasant	Mačukevo	1902, Oct. 30th. At home	—
101	Antonije	Peasant	Pozdevište	1902	—
102	Izaije...	Priest	Pozdevište	1902	—
103	Rista	Peasant	Pozdevište	1902	—
104	Stojan Ristić... ...	Prominent citizen	Baci (Bitolj Villayet)	1903, Jan. 1st. Baci	—
105	Ilija Gjelević... ...	Prominent citizen	Baci	1903, Jan. 1st	—
106	Filip Mincević ...	Prominent citizen	Baci	1903, Jan. 1st	—
107	Dimitrije Demirdžijević	Peasant	Gradobod	1903, Jan. 19th. In the village	—
108	Pantelije Nalević ...	Herdman	Suma	1903, Jan. 31st	—
109	Petar Stojković ...	Herdman	Suma	1903, Jan. 31st	—
110	Rista Smiljković ...	Herdman	Suma	1903, Jan. 31st	—

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
111	Martin Koca... ...	Serbian headman	Novo-Selo (Strumica)	1903, Jan.	Murdered because with the peasants he asked for a Serbian school
112	Nikola...	Priest	Vrbjani	1903, Feb.	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
113	Naum Kulević ...	Peasant	Srpci	1903, March 4th	—
114	Nikola Tiflonić ...	Labourer	Zagoričani	1903, March 8th	—
115	Dimitrije Marčović...	Peasant	Gorenci	1903, March 10th	—
116	Rista Čokslović ...	Peasant	Barovica	1903, March 20th	—
117	Petar Pop-Dimitrijević	Peasant	Barovica	1903, March 20th	—
118	Rista Dbjanac ...	Clerk	Dbjani	1903, March 26th	—
119	Tale	Priest	Srpci	1903, March 28th	—
120	Gjorgje Konstantinović	Peasant	Rakovo	1903, March 28th	Murdered by Sugarev's comitadjis
121	Nastas Ristić ...	Peasant	Baci	1903, March 30th	—
122	Atanasije Domazet...	Peasant	Skočivir	1903, March	—
123	Gjoško Domazet ...	Peasant	Skočivir	1903, March	—
124	Sotir	Priest	Sv. Naum	1903, April 5th	—
125	Toma Gacović ...	Student	Barovica	1903, April 20th. On the road between Gumendža and Barovica	—
126	Dimitrije Pop-Petrović	Peasant	Barovica	1903, April 20th. On the road near the village	—

127	Vasilije Ećim ...	Surgeon	Kratovo	1903, April 21st	—
128	Stojče Cakrović ...	Wealthy peasant	Asanovo	1903, April 24th	—
129	Nikola Ratković ...	Peasant	Asanovo	1903, April 24th	—
130	Ilija Tazović... ...	Peasant	Baci	1903, April 25th	—
131	Rista Varlić	Peasant	Asanovo	1903, May 18th	—
132	Trojan Varlić ...	Peasant	Asanovo	1903, May 18th	—
133	Petar Maslijević ...	Peasant	Asanovo	1903, May 18th	—
134	Dimitrije Nikolajević	Shepherd	Veliki Kamen	1903, June 1st	—
135	Gjorgje Vlajković ...	Peasant	Lubnica	1903, June 3rd	—
136	Vasilije Vlajković ...	Peasant	Lubnica	1903, June 3rd	—
137	Sterije Hadžić ...	Peasant	German	1903, June 3rd	—
138	Dimitrije	Priest	Rakovo	1903, June 5th	Murdered by Sugarev's comitadjis
139	Krsta Trojanović ...	—	Rakovo	1903, June 5th	—
140	Tanas...	Priest	Krušorat	1903, June 8th	—
141	Krsta...	Peasant	Krušorat	1903, June 8th	—
142	Čeljo	Labourer	Dobroveni	1903, June 10th	—
143	Mico Kimović ...	Peasant	Nerez	1903, June 13th	—
144	Mico Stevović ...	Peasant	Nerez	1903, June 13th	—
145	Stojko Micević ...	Peasant	Nerez	1903, June 13th	—
146	Krsta Mitović ...	Peasant	Nerez	1903, June 13th	—
147	Kole Micić	Peasant	Setine	1903, June 15th	—
148	Vasilije Sotirović ...	Peasant	Kostenci	1903, June 16th	—
149	Vasilije Ausević ...	Peasant	Gorničevo	1903, June 21st	—
150	Jovan Bakalin ...	Cab-driver	Kruševo	1903, June 23rd	—
151	Nako	Peasant	Kostenci	1903, June 22nd	—
152	Rista	Peasant	Banjica	1903, June 25th	—
153	Dine Gecović ...	Peasant	Gorničevo	1903, June 25th	—
154	Atanasije Kafać ...	Ranger	Kriva	1903, June 30th. In the village	Bayoneted
155	Rista	Priest	Prekopani	1903, July 23rd	—

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
156	Vane	Peasant	Prekopani	1903, July 23rd	Tongue cut out, eyes gouged out, and finally murdered
157	Janko Kurtović ...	Peasant	Novoljani	1903, Aug. 2nd	—
158	Spira Pop-Naumović	Peasant	Rabi	1903, Aug. 3rd	—
159	Vangel	Peasant	Rabi	1903, Aug. 3rd	—
160	Vangjel Dučević ...	Grocer	Bitolj	1903, Aug. 12th	—
161	Dimitrije P. Hristić	Serbian priest	Crešnica	1903, Aug. 14th	Shot with revolver
162	Petar Šišković ...	Peasant	Vraštu	1903, Aug. In front of his house	—
163	Kirča Božić	Churchwarden	Volak	1903, Aug.	—
164	Gjorgje Vojnović ...	Furrier	Veles	1903, Sept. 4th	—
165	Dimko Mihajlović ...	Superintendent of Serbian school	Krušje	1903, Sept. 17th. Krušje	—
166	Mitar Novović ...	Superintendent of Serbian school	Jablanica	1903, Oct. 18th. Jablanica	—
167	Nikola Germanović...	Peasant	Zrnovo	1903, Oct. 26th	—
168	Gjorgje Germanović	Peasant	Zrnovo	1903, Oct. 26th. Before the village church	—
169	Zafir Jovanović ...	Peasant	Zrnovo	1903, Oct. 26th	—
170	Rono Ribar	Peasant	Mačukovo	1903, Oct. 30th. At home	—
171	Nikola Ribar... ...	Peasant	Mačukovo	1903, Oct. 30th. At home	—

172	Petar Ribar	Peasant	Mačukovo	1903, Oct. 30th. At home	—
173	Fidana Ribar ...	Peasant woman	Mačukovo	1903, Oct. 30th. At home	—
174	Slavka Ribar... ...	Peasant woman	Mačukovo	1903, Oct. 30th. At home	—
175	Rista Marković ...	Member of village council	Nerezi (Ochrida)	1903, Nov. 3rd. Nerezi	—
176	Vasilije Ilić-Cikarce	Citizen	Ratevo (Maleš)	1903, Nov. 3rd. Ratevo	—
177	Antonije Ilić-Cikarce	Priest	Ratevo (Maleš)	1903, Nov. 3rd. Ratevo	—
178	Spira Džambasović...	Serbian headman	Prilep	1903, Dec. 7th. Prilep	—
179	Tanasije Riste Pipcević	Peasant	Kriva	1903, Dec. 12th. On the road	—
180	Gjorgje	Priest	Lubnica	1903, Dec. 29th	—
181	Nikola	Serbian priest	Vrbjane	1903. Vrbjane	Shot at night with rifle
182	Nico Bicaković ...	Notable Serbian	Setina	1903	—
183	Nikola Načević ...	Peasant	Srebreno	1903	—
184	Petar Lenčević ...	Peasant	Bitolj Villayet	1903	—
185	Dimitrije Tašković ...	Boy, aged 12 years	Brusnik	1903	Murdered in the mountains
186	Trajko Petrović ...	Peasant	Dobroveni	1904, Jan. 3rd	—
187	Neda, Petrović's wife	—	Dobroveni	1904, Jan. 3rd	—
188	Kosta Tašević ...	Farm labourer	Vladovo	1904, Jan. 27th	—
189	Anta Božinović ...	Peasant	Zubovo	1904, Jan. 31st. In the mountains	—
190	Marko	Peasant	Apširina	1904, Jan.	—
191	Tanasije	Priest	Zuzelci	1904, Feb. 3rd	—
192	Filip	Peasant	Zuzelci	1904, Feb. 3rd	—

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
193	Micko	Peasant	Gordilovo	1904, Feb. 5th	—
194	Ilija	Peasant	Dobroveni	1904, Feb. 5th	—
195	Ilija	Peasant	Asanovo	1904, Feb. 5th	—
196	Petar Batković ...	Wealthy sheep farmer	Vladovo	1904, Feb. 5th. In the village	Thirty-seven wounds inflicted
197	Stojo	Shepherd	Barenšani	1904, Feb. 10th	—
198	Rista Nenadović ...	Peasant	Budimirci	1904, Feb. 10th	—
199	Božin Traković ...	Peasant	Negovan	1904, Feb. 14th. On the road between Negovan and Salonica	—
200	Rista	Priest	Psaništa	1904, Feb. 16th	—
201	Jorda N.	Peasant	Stramoš (Kratovo)	1904, Feb. 22nd. Stramoš	—
202	Evrozima, sister of Jorda	—	Stramoš (Kratovo)	1904, Feb. 22nd. Stramoš	—
203	Son and daughter-in-law of Evrozima	—	Stramoš (Kratovo)	1904, Feb. 22nd. Stramoš	—
204	Stojča	Peasant	Lang (Prespa)	1904, Feb. 27th	—
205	Dimitrije Ciglina ...	Member of village council	Osipčani	1904, Feb 27th. In the village	Sixty-five wounds inflicted with knife and revolver
206	Son of Jovan from Banjica	Peasant	Astos	1904, Feb.	Clubbed to death
207	Vlada Dimitrijević ...	Farm labourer	Saraište	1904, Feb. 28th. Near Rahovo	—

208	Aleksa Dimitrijević...	Farm labourer	Blaci	1904, Mar. 8th	—
209	Jovko Tomašević ...	Peasant	Skočivir	1904, Mar. 15th	—
210	Atanasije Tomašević	Peasant	Skočivir	1904, Mar. 15th	—
211	Kosta	Priest	Zeleni	1904, March 15th	—
212	Tasko Ičković ...	Member of village council	Brusnik	1904, March	—
213	Mitar Trajković ...	Peasant	Birnik	1904, March	—
214	Dimitrije	Grocer	Banjica	1904, March	—
215	Kosta Saramanče ...	Wealthy sheep farmer	Babjani	1904, April 4th. In his own house	—
216	Wife of K. Saramanče	—	Babjani	1904, April 4th. In her own house	—
217	Mihajlo Saramanče...	Peasant	Babjani	1904, April 4th. In his own house	—
218	Wife of M. Saramanče	—	Babjani	1904, April 4th. In his own house	—
219	Veldan Hristić ...	Peasant	Bahovo	1904, April 6th	—
220	Aleksa Hristić ...	Peasant	Vrbjani	1904, April 20th	—
221	Spasoje	Peasant	Radohoždi	1904, April 23rd	—
222	Božin	Peasant	Orovnik	1904, April	—
223	Jovan Gavran ...	Peasant	Mesimer	1904, May 3rd. In a field	—
224	Konstantin Panajotović	Merchant	Voden	1904, May 9th	—
225	Bogoje N.	Peasant	Buf (Bitolj)	1904, June 15th. Buf	Throat cut
226	Son of Priest Kosta	Peasant	Pesočnica	1904, June 16th	—
227	Nikola Gjuliš ...	Prominent citizen	Brezovo (Kičevo Demir Hisar)	1904, June 21st. On the road	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadji leader, Sugarev

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
228	Gjorgje Gjuliš, son of Nikola	Prominent citizen	Brezovo (Kičevo Demir Hisar)	1904, June 21st. On the road	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadji leader, Sugarev
229	Trajče N.	Prominent citizen	Brezovo (Kičevo Demir Hisar)	1904, June 21st. On the road	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadji leader, Sugarev
230	Deli Vasilije... ...	Peasant	Banjica	1904, June 21st	—
231	Dimo Spasić... ...	Serbian headman	Tatomir (Kratovo District)	1904, June 27th	Murdered by Bulgarian Reserve officer, Spasov
232	Todor Atanasijević ...	Member of village council	Čerešovo	1904, June 28th	—
233	Stojan	Gendarme	Krušejca	1904, June 28th	—
234	Petko Varadin ...	Farm labourer	Sveta	1904, July. Sveta	—
235	Dimitrije Ristić ...	Teacher	Starovina	1904, July 11th	Murdered by Sugarev
236	Dimko Dunković ...	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Bulgarian Reserve officer, Spasov
237	Trojanka, wife of D. Dumković	—	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Bulgarian Reserve officer, Spasov
238	Mladen Čizak ...	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Bulgarian Reserve officer, Spasov
239	Atanas	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	—
240	Srebra, wife of Mladen Čizak	—	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Outraged by Stojanov's comitadjis and afterwards cut to pieces

241	Nesa Mlaćenović ...	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	All fingers cut off, eyes gouged out, tongue cut out, and finally murdered by Spasov's comitadjis
242	Kuzman N. Mladenović-Dunković	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Cut to pieces by Stojanov's comitadjis
243	Petar	Priest	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
244	Dimitrije	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
245	Jovan...	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
246	Filip	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
247	Miloš...	Peasant	Rudare	1904, Aug. 11th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
248	Bosiljka	Peasant woman	Novo Selo (Veles)	1904, Aug. 14th	Massacred by Bulgarians while taking bread to the Serbian comitadjis
249	Stavra Krstić ...	Priest	Podgorac	1904, Aug. 14th	Shot with rifle
250	Serafim Velević ...	Prominent citizen	Vana (Debar)	1904, Aug. On the way to Debar	Shot with rifle
251	Andon Stojanović ...	Peasant	Novo Selo (Veles)	1904, Aug. 14th	—
252	Trajko Stojčević ...	Peasant	Gradobar	1904, Aug. 15th. At home	Badly mutilated
253	Nastasije, son of T. Stojčević	Peasant	Gradobar	1904, Aug. 15th. At home	Badly mutilated
254	Sterije, son of T. Stojčević	Peasant	Gradobar	1904, Aug. 15th. At home	Badly mutilated

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
255	Brajko Hristić ...	Peasant	Novo Selo (Veles)	1904, Aug. 18th	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
256	Srbin Zafirović ...	Peasant	Novo Selo (Veles)	1904, Aug. 18th	—
257	Petar Arizanović ...	Peasant	Negorci	1904, Aug. 21st	—
258	Cile	Peasant	Celani	1904, Aug. 23rd	—
259	Stoja	Peasant	Celani	1904, Aug. 23rd	—
260	Tanasije	Priest	Armensko	1904, Aug. 28th	—
261	Jovan Damulović ...	Peasant	German	1904, Sept. 2nd	—
262	Trojan	Peasant	Dobrusovo	1904, Sept. 2nd	—
263	Rista Gjehaja and his mother	Peasants	Borovica	1904, Sept. 5th	—
264	Atanas Čiprijanović	Citizen	Kumanovo	1904, Sept. 6th	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis for going over to the Serbs
265	Jovan Radenović and Gavrilo Radenović	Two Serbian headmen	Ratevo	1904, Sept. 7th. In the Berovo Mountain	—
266	Petar Gramatiković	Peasant	Krušari	1904, Sept. 10th	—
267	Konstantin Gramatiković	Peasant	Krušari	1904, Sept. 10th	—
268	Two sons of Veljan...	Peasants	Alince (Kumanovo)	1904, Sept. 20th	—
269	(Names unknown) ...	Two prominent peasants	Gerevište	1904, Sept. 20th	—
270	Veljan N.	Member of village council	Brod (Bitolj Vilayet)	1904, Sept. 26th. At the door of the Orthodox Church	—

271	Koča N.	Member of village council	Brod (Bitolj Villayet)	1904, Sept. 26th. At the church door	During Divine Service while the comitadjis were wrecking the church
272	Stojan N.	Priest	Brod (Bitolj Villayet)	1904, Sept. 26th. At the church door	During Divine Service while the comitadjis were wrecking the church
273	Wife of the Priest Stojan	—	Brod (Bitolj Villayet)	1904, Sept. 26th. At the church door	Wounded and afterwards thrown into the flames of her burning house
274	Mino Stojčević ...	Peasant	Leskovac	1904, Oct. 7th	Murdered by Aleksin's comitadjis
275	Zafir Stojčević ...	Peasant	Leskovac	1904, Oct. 7th	Murdered by Aleksin's comitadjis
276	Mico Arantović [1] ...	Peasant	Leskovac	1904, Oct. 7th	Murdered by Aleksin's comitadjis
277	Petar, son of M. Arantević [1]	Peasant	Leskovac	1904, Oct. 7th	Murdered by Alexsin's comitadjis
278	Gjorgje Božić ...	Peasant	Vrastu	1904, Oct.	—
279	Petko Antonović ...	Peasant	Negorci	1904, Oct. 9th	—
280	Petruš	Priest	Kokosinje	1904, Oct.	—
281	Kostantin Šanović ...	Peasant	Gročište	1904, Oct. 24th. In his own house	—
282	Wife and four children of K. Šanović	—	Gročište	1904, Oct. 24th. In his own house	—
283	Three peasants ...	—	Lugunci	1904, Nov.	—
284	Atanas Stojiljković ...	Serbian headman	Dovezenci	1904, Nov. Dovezenci	—

[1] The bodies of these two were found badly mutilated.

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
285	Serbian peasant ...	—	Čučer (Skolpje Crna Gora)	1904, Nov. 5th. Čučer	—
286	Two Serbian peasants	—	Strumica	1904, Nov. 10th. Strumica	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadji leader, Hristo Černopejev
287	Koca Minović ...	Serbian priest	Skolpje	1904, Nov. 15th	Knifed at night
288	Antonije Krmez ...	Carrier	Sorović	1904, Nov. 19th	—
289	Aleksander Dinević...	Carrier	Sorović	1904, Nov. 19th	—
290	Lazar Dinević ...	Carrier	Sorović	1904, Nov. 19th	—
291	Stojan	Priest	Logača (Gjevgjelija)	1904, Dec.	—
292	Wife of the Priest Stojan	—	Logača (Gjevgjelija)	1904, Dec.	—
293	Child of the Priest Stojan	—	Logača (Gjevgjelija)	1904, Dec.	—
294	Jovan Cvetković ...	Teacher	Nivičane	1904	On Easter Day in church
295	Ćiprijan Veljanović...	Peasant	Borijevo (Strumica)	1904	—
296	Gjorgje Mitič ...	Peasant	Borijevo (Strumica)	1904	—
297	Lazar Gligorović ...	Peasant	Bašino Selo	1904	—
298	Stephan Micević ...	Peasant	Kriva-Palanka	1904	—
299	Petruš	Peasant	K'šanje	1904	—
300	Jovan Mitić	Peasant	K'šanje	1904	—
301	Jovan Popović ...	Peasant	Pezovo	1904	—
302	Simeon Mihajlović ...	Peasant	Kućkarevo	1904	—
303	Dimitrije Jlić ...	Peasant	Oglje	1904	—
304	Jordan Velešanač ...	Peasant	Veles	1904	—
305	Jovan Pavlović ...	Peasant	Lezovo	1904	—

306	Rista Trajčević ...	Peasant	Belušina	—	—
307	Tasko Atanas Petrović	Serbian vicar	Kumanovo	1905, Jan. 2nd. Before the church	Four bullet wounds
308	Aćim	Servant of vicar	Kumanovo	1905, Jan. 2nd. Before the church	Ten bullet wounds
309	Laza Đigić	Café-keeper	Bašino Selo	1905, Jan. 7th. In Oblovac	Murdered
310	Toma Mucunović ...	Gendarme	Berovo	1905, Jan. 24th	Strangled; his head was cut off and thrown to the dogs
311	Nastas, brother of Priest Gjerasim	Peasant	Nivičane	1905, Jan.	Murdered by comitadji leaders, Bab and Jordan Spasov
312	Arsa	Member of village council	Nivičane	1905, Jan.	Murdered by comitadji leaders, Bab and Jordan Spasov
313	Danilo Ilić	Peasant	Turaljevo	1905, Jan.	Murdered by comitadji leaders, Bab and Jordan Spasov
314	Tanasije Štrčki ...	Peasant	Nivičane	1905, Jan.	Murdered by comitadji leaders, Bab and Jordan Spasov
315	Gjorgje Domazet ...	Peasant	Zeljeznik	1905, Jan.	Murdered by comitadji leaders, Bab and Jordan Spasov
316	Spasa Krstić... ...	Peasant	Tabanovci	1905, Feb. 3rd	—
317	Simeon Ristić ...	Peasant	Četirce	1905, Feb. 18th	—
318	Petar Cvetković ...	Priest	Kočane	1905, Feb.	—
319	Wife of murdered Petruš	—	K'šanje	1905, Feb.	Throat cut
320	Daughter of murdered Petruš	—	K'šanje	1905, Feb.	Throat cut

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
321	Angjelko Lazarević-"Gorac"	Serbian priest	Kičevo District	1905, April 1st	—
322	Živko Milošević ...	Clerk	Kriva-Palanka	1905, May 29th	Cut to pieces
323	Spiro Angjelković ...	Priest	Karbunica	1905, June 29th. At the church door	—
324	Jovan Ivanović-Sokolović	Peasant	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	—
325	Jovan Aleksić ...	Vicar	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
326	Milan Pop-Petrušević	Nephew of vicar, J. Aleksić	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
327	Mane Car	Peasant	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
328	Mite Pržo	Peasant	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
329	Son of M. Pržo ...	Peasant	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
330	Nephew of M. Pržo	Peasant	Kokošinje	1905, Aug. 6th	Murdered by Jordan Spasov's comitadjis
331	N. N.	Priest	Teovo	1905, Oct.	—
332	Anastas Milenković	Priest	Orahov-Dol	1905, Oct. 15th	Cut to pieces in middle of village
333	Anastas Pločanski ...	Peasant	Orahov-Dol	1905, Oct. 15th	Cut to pieces in middle of village
334	Konstantinka, K. Petrović's wife	—	Kruševo	1905, Dec. 9th	—

335	Nikola Manojlović ...	Priest	Kozlje	1905	Cut to pieces
336	Cvetan	Priest	Crešnjevo	1905	Captured by Bulgars and murdered
337	Novak Todorović ...	Student	Crešnjevo	1905	—
338	Two peasants ...	—	Kumanovo neighbourhood	1905	Murdered for joining the peasants in a petition for a Serbian school
339	A peasant	—	Čučer	1905	—
340	Jordan	Peasant	Stracin	1905	—
341	Ivan	Peasant	Nerezi	1905	—
342	Kosta Šavković ...	Citizen	Kruševo	1906	—
343	Ilija Pop-Antić ...	Serbian bookseller	Prilep	1906, Nov. 1st	—
344	Gjorgje Rujanović ...	Peasant	Prilep District	1907, Jan.	—
345	Kone Stefanović ...	Peasant	Prilep District	1907, Jan.	—
346	Son of K. Stefanović	Peasant	Prilep District	1907, Jan.	—
347	Atanas Šerebetko ...	Peasant	Prilep District	1907, Jan.	—
348	Veljko Nikolić ...	Peasant	Prisat	1907, Jan. 7th	—
349	Momir Cvetković ...	Peasant	Kosin	1907, Feb. 2nd	—
350	Radić Zmejković ...	Innkeeper	Sopište	1907, Feb. 9th	Soaked with paraffin by Bulgars and burnt alive
351	Mitra, Radić's wife ...	—	Sopište	1907, Feb. 9th	Soaked with paraffin by Bulgars and burnt alive
352	Lenka, Radić's daughter	—	Sopište	1907, Feb. 9th	Soaked with paraffin by Bulgars and burnt alive
353	Angjel Domazet ...	Peasant	Orahovac	1907, Feb. 15th	—
354	Nikola Mino	Peasant	Orahovac	1907, Feb. 15th	—
355	Tone Amzić	Peasant	Vrbjane	1907, March 2nd	—
356	Momir Atanasković...	Peasant	Vrbjane	1907, March 20th	—

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
357	Stephan Traković ...	Peasant	Vrbjane	1907, March 20th	—
358	Mihailo Hadzi-Popović	Serbian mayor	Bitolj	1907, May 4th	—
359	Jovan Akeksić ...	Priest	Topolčane (Prilep)	1907, May 17th	—
360	Ivan Džambazović ...	Innkeeper	Prilep	1907, Dec. 27th	—
361	Toma Poljak... ...	Citizen	Prilep	1907	—
362	Toma Mihailović ...	Teacher	Beljakovac	1907	—
363	Dima Šah	Peasant	Banjica	1907	—
364	Petko Domazet ...	Peasant	Teovo	1907	—
365	Tode Viran	Peasant	Vojnica	1907	—
366	Veljko Dimović-Sagmance	Peasant	Kučevište	1907	—
367	Seven Serbian peasants	—	Brodac (Skoplje District)	1907	—
368	Several peasants ...	—	Kozičino	1907	Bulgars set fire to their houses and afterwards threw them into the flames
369	Several peasants ...	—	Kiselca (Kratovo)	1907	Bulgars set fire to their houses and afterwards threw them into the flames.
370	Several peasants ...	—	Ratovo	1907	Bulgars set fire to their houses and afterwards threw them into the flames

371	Atanasije Božinović	Priest	Debar	1907	Murdered by the servant of the Bulgarian State Agency
372	Mile Radibužac ...	Peasant	Kriva-Palanka	1908. Kriva-Palanka	Poisoned
373	Kosta Katrandžija ...	Peasant	Teovo (Veles)	1908	Shot
374	Stevan Tasicka's Grandmother	Citizen	Kumanovo	1908. Kumanovo	Throat cut while sleeping
375	Marija Stugan, Tasicka's daughter	Citizen	Kumanovo	1808. Kumanovo	Throat cut while sleeping
376[1]	Apostol	Priest	Drenak	—	—
377	Gjorgje Jovičić ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
378	Jovan Damunjević ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
379	Simon Ristić ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
380	Spasa Krstić... ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
381	Janičije Ivanić ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
382	Dane Mačević ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
383	Gavrilo Matević ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
384	Milan Aleksić ...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
385	Atanas Stojiljković...	Headman	Kumanovo County	—	—
386	Aleksander Šande ...	Tailor	Kumanovo County	—	Murdered by Todos Gjurcaja
387	Stojiljko Cvetković...	Farm labourer	Kumanovo County	—	—
388	Petar Cvetković ...	Vicar	Kočane County	—	—
389	Arsa Nivičanski ...	Member of village council	Kočane County	—	—
390	Janko Kuzetović ...	Farm labourer	Kočane County	—	—
391	Gjorgje Drekalović ...	Vicar	Kočane County	—	—
392	Aleksa Maleški ...	Vicar	Maleš	—	—
393	Veselin	Member of village council	—	—	—

[1] From Nos. 376 to 433 were murdered between 1904 and 1908.

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
394	Kuzman Ogočničanin	Peasant	Kriva-Palanka County	—	—
395	Filip Ogočničanin ...	Peasant	Kriva-Palanka County	—	—
396	Mitar Čkurta ...	Peasant	Petraljica	—	—
397	Miloš	Peasant	Gilovac	—	—
398	Rista	Peasant	Dubočica	—	—
399	Jovan...	Peasant	Dubočica	—	—
400	Stanko	Peasant	Dubočica	—	—
401	Sarafim	Peasant	Stanča	—	—
402	Trajko	Peasant	Gulinac	—	—
403	Ivan Stanojević ...	Peasant	Podrzikonj	—	—
404	Gerasim Filipović ...	Tile-maker	Tetovo County	—	—
405	Janče Stepanović ...	Innkeeper	Tetovo County	—	—
406	Jovan Apostolović ...	Cab-driver	Tetovo	—	—
407	Apostol, J. Apostolović's father	—	Tetovo	—	—
408	Jovan Teofilović ...	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
409	Vasa Apostolović ...	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
410	Mita Milijanović ...	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
411	Petar Trpčević ...	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
412	Dimitrije Milosavljević	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—

413	Krsta Kočić	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
414	Toma Avramović ...	Farm labourer	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
415	Zafir Josifović ...	Miller	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
416	Arsen Lefterović ...	Headman	Beličica	—	—
417	Rahida Dejanović ...	Peasant woman	Mavrovo	—	—
418	Micko Dimić ...	Peasant	Karbunica	—	—
419	Tamasije Stojković...	Peasant	Karbunica	—	—
420	Nikodim Tanasijević	Peasant	Karbunica	—	—
421	Nastas Krsevski ...	Peasant	Karbunica	—	—
422	Bogdan	Member of village council	Radibuž	—	—
423	Kosta Epirski ...	Peasant	Kratovo County	—	—
424	Bojko Levković ...	Member of village council	Kratovo County	—	—
425	*Atanas Stalkovski ...*	*Member of village council*	*Kratovo County*	—	—
426	Gjorgje Dimitrijević	Peasant	Kratovo County	—	—
427	Danilo Ilić	Peasant	Kratovo County	—	—
428	Gjorgje Domazet ...	Farm labourer	Kratovo County	—	—
429	Gjorgje Čukčuković	Workman	Kratovo County	—	—
430	Todosije	Member of village council	Kratovo County	—	Murdered by the Bulgars; his horse sold in Custendil for the benefit of the comitadjis
431	Jovan Milosavljević	Teacher	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
432	Stojka Milosavljević	Miller	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—

NO.	NAME OF THE VICTIM.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE OR BIRTHPLACE.	YEAR AND PLACE OF MURDER.	REMARKS ON THE MURDER.
433	Risto Stojčević ...	Foreman	Tetovo - Gostivar County	—	—
434	Konstantin	Priest	Zašlje	1909, summer	Murdered by the Bulgarian teacher Bristov and the grocer Vančo
435	Todor Pavlović ...	Prominent Serbian	Drenovac	1909, Aug. Crnuš	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
436	N. N.	Peasant	Drenovi (Kičevo)	1909, Aug.	—
437	Laza Dimitrijević ...	Peasant	Voden District	1909, Sept.	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
438	Two Serbian peasants	-	Voden District	1909, Sept.	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
439	Naka	Peasant	Popovljane (Kičevo)	1909, Sept.	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
440	Nikola Mihajlović ...	-	Patojec	1909, Sept.	Murdered by Bulgarian comitadjis
441	N. N.	Peasant	Babina	1909, Sept.	Murdered by the Bulgarian comitadji leader in the Kičevo district
442	Two peasants ...	—	Veliko Ilino	1909, Sept.	Murdered by the Bulgarian comitadji leader in the Kičevo district
443	N. N.	Peasant	Džvane	1909, Sept.	Murdered by the Bulgarian comitadji leader in the Kičevo district

444	Mirko Kratević ...		—	Poreč	1909, Oct. 18th. Near Ižica (Kičevo)	—
445	Jovan Veljanović ...	Peasant		Orlanci	1909, Oct.	Both murdered for exerting themselves for the opening of Serbian schools
446	Naka Mojsević ...	Peasant		Orlanci	1909, Oct.	
447	Jovan Dečević ...	Peasant		Radibuž (Palanka)	1909, Oct.	—
448	Mihailo Mladenović	Peasant		Robetin (Kičevo)	1909, Oct.	—
449	Mitar Slavković ...	Peasant		Koselj (Ochrida)	1909. Suva Česma	Murdered on the road
450	Vele Filipović ...	Peasant		Koselj (Ochrida)	1909. Suva Česma	Murdered on the road
451	Vele Pejčinović ...	Peasant		Koselj (Ochrida)	1909. Suva Česma	Murdered on the road
452	Tomče Pejčinović ...	Peasant		Koselj (Ochrida)	1909. Suva Česma	Murdered on the road
453	Nikola Mutavdžija ...	Peasant		Teovo (Veles)	1909. Teovo	—
454	Aleksa Petrović ...	Peasant		Oraov-Do (Veles)	1909. Oraov-Do	—
455	Atanas Stojilković ...		—	Kožlje (Skoplje)	1909. Near Pčinja	Murdered on the road
456	Three peasants ...			Pateli (Kostur)	1909. Kostur	—
457	Nikola Jovanović ...	Peasant		Odra (Tetovo)	1909. Odra	—
458	Jovan Stojković ...	Peasant		Eksi Su (Lerin)	1909. Lerin	Murdered on the road
459	Toma Kožar... ...	Peasant		Sorović (Ostrovo)	1909. Sorović	—
460	Gligor Dimitrijević ...	Citizen		Jenidže-Vardar	1909. Jenidze-Vardar	—
461	Bogdan Stefanović ...	Peasant		Morijevo	1909. Morijevo	—
462	Jovan Trojković ...	Peasant		Morijevo	1909. Morijevo	—
463	Strezo Kostić ...	Peasant		Galičnik	1909. Galičnik	—
464	Nikola Perović ...	Miller		Nebregovo (Prilep)	1900. Nebregovo	Murdered at the mill
465	Dimko Dovezenski...	Peasant		Dovezence (Kumanovo)	1909. Dovezence	—
466	Milan Gjorgjević ...	Peasant		Slepče (Prilep)	1909. Slepče	Murdered; his brother was mortally wounded at the same time

[1] From Nos. 876 to 433 were murdered between 1904 and 1908.

VII

INCOMPLETE LIST OF ATTEMPTED MURDERS PERPETRATED BY BULGARS ON SERBS BETWEEN 1897 AND 1901

THE number of attempted murders perpetrated by Bulgars on Macedonian Serbs is far greater than that of successful murders. Unfortunately we have no statistics available. We give instead only a few cases which occurred between 1897 and 1901, and this list, though incomplete, throws some light upon the terror practised by the Bulgars among the Serbian population of Macedonia. According to the information at our disposal the Bulgars attempted to murder the following persons:—

1. Petar Dimitrijević, head master of the Serbian school in Prilep.[1]
2. Jovanka Hrnjiček, teacher at the Serbian Lycée for Girls in Skoplje.
3. Jevdja Frtunić, schoolmaster in Skoplje.
4. Ilija Spirkovic, Serbian booksellor in Prilep.
5. Veljan, the most prominent peasant and Serbian headman in Krivogaštane (district of Prilep).
6. Dr. Čeda Djurdjević, Serbian physician in Skoplje.
7. Mihalilo Hadži Popović, president of the Serbian congregation in Bitolj, who was wounded in both hands with a knife by the Bulgars.
8. The servant of Dr. Čeda Djurdjević, Serbian physician in Skoplje, also wounded with a knife.
9. Djordje Dimitrijević, member of the Serbian congregation, received severe knife and bullet wounds.
10. In Veles, after murdering the Serbian headman Petar Tasević and several other Serbs from the neighbourhood, the Bulgars assaulted numerous other Serbs with knives and firearms.

---

[1] Petar Dimitrijević's daughter was murdered by the Bulgars in September 1897.

11. Ilija Vučetic, Serbian professor in Skoplje, severely wounded on January 18, 1899.
12. Jovan Jovičević, head master of the Serbian school in Kukuš shot by Bulgarian comitadjis on May 12, 1899.
13. Vanča Ilić, Serbian bookseller in Bitolj, shot and severely wounded in July 1899.
14. Dimko Petruševic, proprietor of the school in Orahovac (district of Veles), received a bullet wound on September 19, 1899. He was eventually murdered.
15. Dinko Pandović, of Veles, wounded in September 1899.
16. Naum Nikolić, of Tajmište, was taken to the mountains with the intention to murder him, but was ransomed by the village on September 21, 1899.
17. Dimo Dapčević, Dan Burčević and Damčević received knife wounds on September 28, 1899.
18. Jovan Milenković, a prominent Serb of Veles, wounded with a knife on September 28, 1899.
19. Velimir Janićijević, member of the Serbian school parish and his mother, assaulted by the Bulgarian teachers in October 1899.
20. Govedarović, proprietor of the Serbian school in Seres, attacked one night in October 1899.
21. Marko Stavrić, Serbian teacher in Jablanica (district of Debar), wounded by a revolver shot on October 27, 1899.
22. Jovan Popović, of Bela (near Koćani), assaulted by the Bulgars on Christmas Day, 1899.
23. Teofil Djordjević, of Gostivar, wounded in December 1899.
24. Stojan Nastović and two other Serbs from Orahovac (district of Veles), who were severely wounded on January 4, 1900.
25. Laza Ilić, Serbian teacher in Novo Selo (district of Skoplje), wounded with a knife in May 1900.
26. Anastas Milenković, priest, of Tehovo (district of Veles), four times shot at with a rifle, finally with a revolver on December 30, 1900, and eventually murdered.
27. Todo Gašević, merchant, of Tetovo, wounded on November 1, 1901.
28. Samuilo Stojković, of Bresna (district of Tetovo), wounded in December 1901, and robbed of 1,000 dinars.
29. Petar Konstantinović, founder of the Serbian school in Zrže (district of Prilep), twice shot at with a rifle, and eventually murdered in 1901.[1]

---

[1] Iv. Ivanić, "Maćedonija i Maćedonci" ("Macedonia and the Macedonians"), Novi Sad, 1909, pp. 471–475.

VIII

BULGARIAN PROCLAMATION IN 1879, CALLING UPON THE INHABITANTS OF MACEDONIA TO RISE AGAINST THE TURKS

UP, brothers! (lit. to your feet, brothers!) The hour of deliverance has struck. Now the chains must and will be broken wherewith cold diplomatic calculation would bind you. The sun of liberty, which is already shedding its warmth upon part of our nation, will arise also upon the remainder, which is still torpid in slavery, and awaken it to new life. We have provided arms; take them and join the fighting lines. There is no other choice open to you. If you let slip the present propitious moment, you will for ever remain in foreign bondage. Already preparations are being made to deprive you of your faith, together with your nationality. If you desire to remain Orthodox as your fathers have been, you must no longer put off the great and holy war. You will be led by experienced soldiers, sincere patriots, heroic men, and our cause will be victorious. Our oppressor is nearing his death. His seeming display of strength is only the last spasm of a dying man, and we have no other enemies to fear. Any foreign intervention in favour of our oppressor will provoke an intervention likewise on our behalf. The moment is propitious, as you see. Long live the War of Liberty! Let us fight until we have won the frontiers which the Almighty has assigned to our people. Up! To battle! Our reward will be the freedom of us all, the heroic death of individuals—our pride.[1]

---

[1] J. H. Vasiljević, "Pokret Srba i Bugara u Turskoj" ("Insurrection of the Serbs and Bulgars in Turkey"), Belgrade, 1908, pp. 18–14.

Printed in Great Britain by
UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, THE GRESHAM PRESS, WOKING AND LONDON

Japan at the Cross Roads

BY A. M. POOLEY

Late Exhibitioner of Clare College, Cambridge. Editor of "The Secret Memoirs of Count Hayashi," etc., etc.

Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

"Extremely critical and of exceptional interest."—*Daily News.*

"Is arrestingly candid and absorbingly interesting."—*Glasgow Herald.*

War and Revolution in Asiatic Russia BY M. PHILIPS PRICE

Demy 8vo. *About* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

In this book Mr. M. Philips Price, who went to the Near East in 1915 as the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, gives an account of his experiences and observations during his journeys through Northern Persia, Armenia, and the Caucasus. The first two chapters tell the story of the War on the Caucasus Front down to the Fall of Erzerum. Other chapters consist of the journal of his travels through the territories occupied by the Russian Army, where he spent many months in organizing relief for the destitute native population. The last four chapters describe the Revolution in the Caucasus, and discuss the racial problems and the political future of the countries he visited.

Three Aspects of the Russian Revolution BY EMILE VANDERVELDE

TRANSLATED BY JEAN E. H. FINDLAY

Crown 8vo. 5*s. net.*

M. Vandervelde's book gives in broad outline a comprehensive view of the Russian Revolution in its political, military, and industrial aspects. M. Louis de Broukère, the well-known Belgian Socialist, and Lieutenant de Mann, who accompanied M. Vandervelde on his recent mission to Russia, contribute valuable material on the industrial and military problems. The book is characterized by a lucidity and breadth of view which enable us to arrive at definite conclusions regarding the much-discussed question of the future of Russia and her share in the reconstruction of Europe.

A Dying Empire

BY BOGUMIL VOSNJAK

WITH A PREFACE BY T. P. O'CONNOR, M.P.

Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d. net.* *Postage* 5*d.*

In this account of the Dying Empire of Austria the author has tried to describe the sociological factors in the breakdown of the Hapsburg Empire, and to show that in the fabric of a "Central Europe" is closely woven the idea of a predominating Pan-Germanism. Either Germany must stretch from Hamburg to Trieste and Salonika, or Austria-Hungary must be dismembered. There is no alternative.

The Awakening of the German People

By Dr. OTFRIED NIPPOLD
Professor of International Law at Berne University
Author of "Der Deutsche Chauvinismus," etc.

Translated by ALEXANDER GRAY

Demy 8vo. Paper. 56 pp. *1s. net.*

Dr. Nippold discusses the various influences which so far have prevented the German people from awakening to the truth with regard to the war, and emphasizes the necessity of such an awakening if a secure peace is to be established. "The future Europe and the future of the German people cannot possibly be built on a lie."

Poland Past and Present

Crown 8vo. By J. H. HARLEY *4s. 6d. net. Postage 5d.*

"We can recommend the history of this wonderful people . . . setting out clearly the chief points of a romantic story."—*Morning Post.*

Bohemia's Case for Independence

By EDWARD BENEŠ, D.Litt.
Lecturer at Prague University, etc., etc.

With an Introduction by HENRY WICKHAM STEED

Crown 8vo. *2s. 6d. net.*

"A short and telling volume, which ought to be read and made known widely."—*New Europe.*

The Future of Constantinople

By LEONARD S. WOOLF

Crown 8vo. *2s. 6d. net. Postage 4d.*

"A very thorough piece of work and is one of the essential books."—*Leicester Pioneer.*

"An admirable little book."—*Common Sense.*

Problems of the Peace

BY WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON

Author of "The Evolution of Modern Germany"

Demy 8vo. *7s. 6d. net.*

"Mr. Dawson's volume stands out conspicuously from a multitude of recent publications respecting problems of the peace. 'It is not heat, but light,' is the refrain of every chapter, and most readers will admit that he has helped to clear up some of the many difficulties involved in the problems of the peace."—*Times.*

After-War Problems

BY THE LATE EARL OF CROMER, VISCOUNT HALDANE, THE BISHOP OF EXETER, PROF. ALFRED MARSHALL, AND OTHERS

EDITED BY WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON

Demy 8vo. THIRD IMPRESSION. *7s. 6d. net.* *Postage 6d.*

"Valuable, clear, sober, and judicial."—*The Times.*

"Will be very helpful to thoughtful persons."—*Morning Post.*

"A book of real national importance, and of which the value may very well prove to be incalculable."—*Daily Telegraph.*

The Choice Before Us

BY G. LOWES DICKINSON

Demy 8vo. SECOND IMPRESSION. *6s. net.* *Postage 6d.*

There are many pages in this volume which express admirably the opinions of calm, clear-thinking men."—*The Times.*

"A noble book which everyone should read."—*Daily News.*

America and Freedom

Being the Statements of PRESIDENT WILSON on the War

WITH A PREFACE BY THE

RT. HON. VISCOUNT GREY OF FALLODON, K.G.

Demy 8vo. *Paper Covers, 1s. net.* *Postage 2d.*

"We would like to see this little book printed in millions of copies at the national expense and carried into every household in this country."—*Spectator.*

The Political History of Japan in the Meiji Era

By PROF. W. W. MCLAREN. Demy 8vo, 12s. 6d. net. Postage 6d.

"A valuable and suggestive book."—*Saturday Review.*

History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century

By HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE. Translated by E. and C. PAUL. With INTRODUCTIONS by WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON. Six Vols. Price 12s. 6d. net per vol. (in sets only). Postage 6d. per vol.

Poland and the Polish Question Impressions and Afterthoughts By NINIAN HILL.

Demy 8vo, with Illustrations and a Map, 10s. 6d. net. Postage 5d.

Poland's Case for Independence

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d. net. Postage 4d.

"A book . . . rich in instruction and in interest for all classes of readers."—*Scotsman.* "An admirable summary of the country's distinguished and turbulent past."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

History of Africa South of the Zambesi

From September 1505 to September 1795. In Three Volumes. With Maps and Plates. By DR. GEORGE MCCALL THEAL. Vol. I., THIRD EDITION, Revised and Enlarged. (Vols. II. and III., REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION, in preparation.) Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

History of South Africa from 1795 to 1872

Five Volumes. With 15 Maps and Plans. By DR. GEORGE MCCALL THEAL. *Vols. I. and II., FOURTH EDITION; Vol. III., THIRD EDITION, all Enlarged and Rewritten; Vols. IV. and V. are in their SECOND EDITION. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.*

SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUME (1873–1881) in preparation.

History of the Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe By EDWARD M. HULME.

Demy 8vo, 589 pages, with 8 Maps, 10s. net. Postage 6d.

The French Renascence By DR. CHARLES SAROLEA.

Large Crown 8vo, Cloth, with Illustrations, 5s. net. Postage 6d.

"This is the work of a philosopher, a jurist, and a keen observer."—*Globe.*

A Brief History of the French Revolution

By F. W. AVELING, M.A., B.Sc. *Illustrated. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.*

"A concise and clear sketch of that terrible drama."

A Short History of English Rural Life

From the Anglo-Saxon Invasion to the Present Time. By MONTAGUE FORDHAM, M.A. (Cantab). With a PREFACE by SIR CHARLES BATHURST, M.A., M.P.

Large Crown 8vo, Cloth, 3s. 6d. net; Paper 2s. 6d. net. Postage 4d.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LIMITED

00037441

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018